IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 118

International Court of Justice

H0118 - 0002

Official transcript of the International Military Tribunal in the matter of the United States of America, the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against Hermann Wilhelm Goering et al, Defendants, sitting at Nurnberg, Germany, on 29 April 1946, 1000-1300, Lord Justice Lawrence presiding.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx.

DR. MARX (Counsel for Defendant Streicher): Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Tribunal: Before continuing with questions to the Defendant Streicher, may I ask permission to make a statement.

Mr. Streicher, on Friday afternoon, referred to a case connected with the press which had dealt with my person and my attitude as a solicitor. I have found in this case cause for me to refer to this matter in my statement, and I have pointed out that I at that time was asking for the protection of this Tribunal against an attack lowering my reputation, which was given to me in a very kind way. On that occasion, and on the occasion when I gave an extemporized explanation, I used the words "newspaper writer." I used it exclusively with reference to that particular journalist who had written the article in question in that Berlin newspaper regarding my person and regarding my activities as a lawyer.

Under no circumstances did I mean to express or was I intending to express that I was talking about the press in general. That was far from me. And I did not wish in any way to refer to the group of press experts or in particular the members of the world press who are active during this trial. I did not wish to attack them or in any way insult their honor.

The reason for this statement of mine is a statement made in the wireless, according to which I, lawyer Marx, had attacked the press in general and made insulting remarks. I am, of course, aware of the significance of the press. I know, of course, what the press has to do, and I should want to be the last person who would fail to recognize in full the extreme responsibility and the useful work done by the press.

May I, therefore, quite publicly state before this Tribunal what I have

H0118-0003

just said, and may I be permitted to make this statement to the gentlemen of the press in the spirit in which it is made, namely, that this was merely a special reference to this particular journalist, but not in any way to the entire press. That is what I wanted to say.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, the Tribunal understood your statement the other day in the sense in which you have now explained it.

DR. MARX: With the permission of the Tribunal, I shall then continue with my examination.

BY DR. MARX:

Q. Witness, which aims did you pursue with your speeches and your articles in "Der Stuermer"?

A. My speeches and my articles which I wrote were meant to inform the public about a question which appeared to me as being one of the most important problems. I didn't want to cause hatred or anger. I wanted to explain.

Q. Apart from your weekly journal, and particularly since the Party came into power, were there any other instruements of the press in Germany which were discussing the Jewish problem in an antagonistic way?

A. Anti-Semitic writings in the press in Germany existed for centuries. A book, for instance, was confiscated among my property, written by Martin Luther. He would very probably sit in my place in the Defendant's bench if thi book had been used by the Prosecution. In the book "The Jews and Their Lies", Dr. Martin Luther writes that the one should brun them down to the ground and destroy them.

Q. Mr. Streicher, that wasn't my question. I am asking you to answer my question in accordance to the way I put it. Please answer with yes or no, first of all, whether were there --

MR. JUSTICE JACKSON: I should like to interpose an objection to this method of answering unresponsively and with speeches here. We are utterly unable in this procedure to make objections when answers are not responsive to questions. We have already got into this case through Streicher's volunteered speeches an attack on the United States which will take considerable evidence

H0118-0004

to answer if we are to answer it. It seems to me very improper that a witness should do anything but make a responsive answer to a question, so that we may control this proceeding from getting into issues that have nothing to do with here. It will not help the Tribunal to go into questions which Streicher has raised here against us to decide the one question, which is his guilt or innocence -- a matter that is perfectly capable of explanation, if we take the time to do it.

It seems to me that this witness should be admonished and admonished so that he will understand it, if that is possible, that he is to answer question and stop, so that we can know and object to orations on irrelevant subjects.

H0118 - 0005

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, will you try, when you put the questions to the witness, to stop him if he is not answering the questions you put to him?

DR. MARX: Yes, Mr. President. I was just in the process--

THE PRESIDENT: Defendant Streicher, you have heard what has been said and you will understand that the Tribunal cannot put up with your long speeche which are not answers to questionswhich are put to you.

BY DR. MARX:

Q. I now repeat the question that I'm asking you. First of all, I want you to answer the question with yes or no, and then to add a brief explanation regarding the context of the question. Apart from your weekly journal and, particularly, since the seizure of power through the Party, were there other instruments of the press in which the Jewish problem was dealt with in an antagonistic way?

A. Yes. Even before the seizure of power in every district and county there were weekly journals that were anti-Semitic and one daily paper called the "Der Voelkische Beobachter" in Munich. Apart from that, there were a numb of publications which weren't acting directly for the Party. There were also anti-Semitic writings after the seizure of power. The daily press was co-ordinated, and now the Party suddenly found themselves in control of three thousand daily papers and numerous weekly journals. Any number of other periodicals and orders had been given by the Fuehrer that every newspaper should give enlightening articles about the Jewish problem. The anti-Semitic enlightenment was, therefore, after the seizure of power carried out on a very large scale in the daily press as well as weekly journals, periodicals and books. The "Stuermer", therefore, with its enlightening activity was not isolated, but I want to state quite openly that I have enlightened about them all in the most popular way.

Q. Were the directives necessary for this issued by an essential source, essential department, say, for instance, the National Socialist correspondent?

A. Yes. The propaganda ministry in Berlin issued a National Socialist press correspondence. In this correspondence, and in every number of it, there were a number of articles enlightening on the Jewish problem. During

H0118-0006

the war the Fuehrer personally had given the order that the press, much more than until then, should publish enlightening articles about the Jewish question.

Q. The Prosecution have accused you that you had contributed to mass murder by causing hatred and, according to the report of the Attorner General in 1936, the following accusation has been raised against you: No Government in this world could have carried out the nass extermination as it was done without that a nation stood behind it which agreed, and that you are supposed to have brought it about. What have you got to say about it?

A. To that I have to say the following: Inciting means to bring a man into a condition of excitement to the extent of which he commits

H0118-0007

an irresponsible deed. Have the contents of the "Stuermer" done so? Have they? The question must be answered here, "What did the 'Stuermer' write?" Several volumes of the "Stuermer" are available, but one should have to look at all the editions of all the twenty years so that you could exhaustively answer that question.

I have written and printed enlightening articles during those twenty years dealing with the race, dealing with what the Jews have written in the Old Testament themselves, what they have written in the "Talmud". I have printed excerpts from Jewish historical works, for instance, written by Professor Dr. Graetz, the Jewish scientist Gutnot, and in the "Stuermer" no leading article has been written by me or has appeared written by one of my main officers, in which I did not bring quotations from the old history of the Jews, the Old Testament and Jewish historical works of recent times.

It is important, and I must emphasize, that I pointed out in all the articles that prominent Jews, leading authors, of themselves admitted that during the twenty years I have made public statements as author and as orator. It is my conviction that the contents of the "Stuermer" as such were not inciting. During the whole of the twenty years I have never clearly said, "Burn Jewish houses down; beat them to death." Never once did such an incitement appear in the "Stuermer".

And now here is the proof to be furnished that any deed, any act, happened since the "Stuermer" appeared, and did either of them say "This is the result of an incitemamt; it is a deed due to an incitement." And, as such, I would, for instance, regard a program as a spontaneous deed if the population suddenly raised an excitement to beat other people to death. During the twenty years no program took place in Germany. During the twenty years, as far as I know, no Jew was killed, no murder took place, of which you could have said, "This is the result of an

H0118 - 0008

incitement which had been carried out by anti-Semitic authors or speech makers."

Gentlemen, we are in Nurnberg. In the past there was a saying that nowhere were the Jews in Germany so safe and so unmolested as they had been in Nurnberg.

THE PRESIDENT: Is not this becoming a rather lengthy speech?

Q Streicher, you've explained this quite sufficiently, so that one can form an opinion. Do you want to say, "I have incited so that no spontaneous action carried out by any certain groups of people or originating from the masses against the Jews did happen"?

A May I make a remark on that subject? Here we are concerned with the most mysterious and most decisive accusation raised against me by the Prosecution, and in this connection I ask the Tribunal to permit me to defend myself against it. It is the most significant fact that in Nurnberg, of all places, no murder took place, no single murder and no corrupt action. It is a fact.

THE PRESIDENT: You have already said it. I have just written down, before I intervened, saying that no Jews have been killed, not only in Nurnberg, but anywhere else, as a result of your incitement.

BY DR. MARX:

Q Witness, we shall have to refer to these demonstrations of the 9th and 10th of November, 1938, later.

A Yes, but may I continue?

THE PRESIDENT: What is the question?

A (Continuing) The Prosecution have accused me that by inciting I had indirectly contributed to mass extermination, and so, may I ask to be allowed to explain? Something has been ascertained about which I didn't know. I received knowledge of t testament left behind by the Fuehrer, and I assumed that a few moments before his death the Fuehrer would have told the truth in

H0118-0009

that testament. He says that mass exterminations had been carried out by his orders and that these mass exterminations had been reprisals. That proves that I, myself, cannot have been a participant in those incredible matters which occurred here. I am finished.

You have said that the Prosecution are accusing me in saying that these mass killings could not have been possible if, behind the Government and behind the leaders in the state, there hadn't been a knowing people. Gentlemen, first of all, the question, "Did the German people really know what was happening during the years of the war?" We know today--

H0118 - 0010

THE PRESIDENT: That is a matter of argument and not a matter upon which you can give evidence. You can say what you knew.

THE WITNESS: I was a part of that nation during the war. During that war I was living in the country in loneliness. For five years I never left my farm. I was watched by the Gestapo, and since the year of 1939 the Feuhrer had --

BY DR. MARX:

Q. (Interposing) Forgive me for interrupting. Mr Streicher, we were coming to that later. I have asked you a question, and I now continue to put the next question, and the other business will come later.

A. But I wish to state that I have had no opportunity so far, that I have had no chance to learn what in fact was going on. Mass killings, mass murders, I only heard of at Mondorf when I was in prison. But I am stating here that if I had been told that two or three million people were killed, then I wouldn't have believed it. I would not have believed that it was technically possible to kill so many people.

Because of the entire attitude and the psychology of the Fuehrer as I saw it, I would not have believed it, that is, that mass killings to that extent to which they had taken place could have taken place at all. Finished.

Q. You are also being accused that it had been the task of the educators of the nation to educate people and poison them with hatred, and that you particularly had devoted yourself to that task. What are you replying to that accusation?

A. That is the statement that we have trained murderers. The contents of the articles which I have written couldn't train murderers and no murders took place, and that is the proof, that is the evidence that we didn't train murderers. The thing which happened during the war -- well, I certainly did not educate the Fuehrer. The Fuehrer has given the order on his own initiative.

Q. I now continue. It has also been stated by the Prosecution that Himmler and Kaltenbrunner and other SS leaders would have had had no one to carry out their orders to kill if you hadn't made that propaganda and if you

H0118 - 0011

hadn't conducted the education of the German people in that sense. Will you make a statement on that?

A. I don't believe that the National Socialists you have mentioned read "Der Stuermer" every week. I don't believe that those who had been given the order by the Fuehrer to carry out killings or to pass on an order to kill, that those people would have been made to do this by my periodical. Hitler's book, "Mein Kampf", existed, and the contents of that book were the authority, the cause. And I don't believe that the mentioned persons have read that book either and carried out the order on the strength of it.

Based on my knowledge of what was going on in the movement, I am convinced that if the Fuehrer gave an order everyone acted, and I am stating here that maybe fate has been kind to me. If the Fuehrer had ordered me to do those things I wouldn't have been able to kill, and perhaps today I would be indicted in some way or other which is now not possible against me. Perhaps fate has been kind.

But, at any rate, conditions were in fact that the Fuehrer was hypnotizine, was suggesting, and they didn't quite understand. His ways were so unusual. Yet, if you know, you will realize that everyone who had an order would act, and thus I must describe as untrue and incorrect what has been thought fit to be stated against me.

Q. What do you know about the general attitude of Adolf Hitler regarding the Jewish question? When did Hitler become hostile to the Jews at all, as far as you know?

A. Even before Adolf Hitler became a popularly known figure, I had written anti-Semitic articles. However, only on the strength of his book, "Mein Kampf," did I learn about the historic connection of the Jewish problem. Hitler wrote his book when he was in prison in Landsberg. Anyone who knows the book will also know that Hitler, many years back, either to study anti-Semitic literature or for some other experience, must have come to the conclusion and the knowledge which made it possible for him to write that book in so short a time in prison.

In other words, Adolf Hitler in his book had stated to the world that he

H0118-0012

was anti-Semitic and that he knew the Jewish problem to the last letter. He himself has often said to me personally --

THE PRESIDENT: (Interposing) Dr. Marx, the book, "Mein Kampf", is in evidence, and it speaks for itself.

THE WITNESS: I am new coming to the answer to your question, not with reference to the book. But you asked me whether Adolf Hitler talked about the Jewish problem to me. The answer is yes. Adolf Hitler always discussed the Jewish problem when he talked about Bolshevism.

It is probably of importance in answering that question to ask oneself, did Hitler want a war against Russia? Did he warn long in advance that such a war would come? When he sat together with us, Adolf Hitler said that Stalin was a man whom he worshipped as a man of action, but in reality he was surrounded by Jewish leaders, and that Bolshevism --

BY DR. MARX:

Q. (Interposing) Mr. Streicher, that is going too far again. The question was quite exact, the question which I put, and I am asking you not to go into so many details. You have heard that the Tribunal is objecting, and in the interest of not delaying the proceedings you must not go into so many details. You mustn't make speeches.

GENERAL RUDENKO: I believe, Mr. President, that Mr. Justice Jackson has justly remarked a short while ago that the defendant Streicher lets himself be dragged into speeches and does not answer the questions which are put to him. Therefore, I would like to draw the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that the witness would eliminate the speeches, and he should be admonished to answer directly to the questions put to him.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you go on, Dr. Marx, and try and keep the witness to an answer to the questions which you have no doubt prepared.

DR. MARX: Very well, Mr. President.

THE QITNESS: May I, please, as a defendant here say a few words regarding the question --

THE PRESIDENT: (Interposing) No, you may certainly not. You will answer the questions, please.

H0118 - 0013

BY DR. MARX:

Q. Next question. Is there any reason for the assumption that Hitler, when he decided that Jews should be exterminated in masses, was subject to any influence, or what is to be considered the motive for that dreadful decision?

A. The Fuehrer could not be influenced. If somebody had gone to see him and told him that Jews should be killed, then he would have turned him down. And, if, during the war someone had gone to him and said "I have learned that you are giving the orders that mass exterminations are to be carried out," then he would have turned that man down too. I therefore answer your question by saying that the Fuehrer co ld not be influenced.

Q. In other words, you want to say that his decision was made on his own initiative.

A. I have already said that that becomes clear from his last will.

Q. In August 1938 the main synagoge in Nurnberg burned down. Was it set on fire by your orders?

A. Yes. In my Gau, in my district, there were approximately 15 synagogue one main synagogue in Nurnberg, a smaller one, and I think there were several praying rooms. The main synagogue stood in the middle of the medieval town of the Reich. Already before 1933, during the so-called time of struggle, when we still had another type of Government, I had stated publicly during a meeting that it was a disgrace that in the old, medieval city such an oriental, tremendously large building should have been put.

After the seizure of power I told the Lord Mayor that he should have the synagogue dismantled, and at the same time the planetarium. May I point out that after the World War, in the middle of the "ring" of the city and in the garden which was there for the recreation of the citizens, a planetarium had been built, an ugly brick building. I gave the order to break down that building and said that the main synagogue, too, should be torn down.

If it had been my intention to deprive the Jews of their synagogue, then I would have given the order after the seizure of power that every synagogue in my district should be torn down, and all synagogues in Nurnberg would have been torn down by my orders.

H0118 - 0014

But it is a fact that in the spring of 1938 the synagogue, the main synagogue, was torn down. The synagogue in the Westheim Strasse in the new town remained untouched. That the order was given in November of that year to burn down the synagogue, that is no fault of mine.

H0118-0015

Q In other words, you want to say that you did not order the tearing down of these buildings for those reasons but you ordered it because it didn't fit in the style of the city?

A For reasons of town buildings, yes. Originally, I wanted to submit a picture to the bureau but unfortunately I didn't get it.

Q Yes, we have got a picture.

A Yes, but you can't see the synogogue on it.I don't know whether the Tribuna wants to see this picture, this actual picture of these old houses, but the fron· view of the synogogue as it was seen by Hans Sachs square was not visible. I don't know whether I may submit this to the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, certainly. the photograph can be put in. Let us see the photograph.

DR. MARX: In that case, I am submitting it to the Tribunal as evidence and I am asking you to accept it accordingly.

THE PRESIDENT: What will it be, exhibit what?

DR. MARX: I am afraid I cannot say at themoment, Mr President. I shall take t he liberty of stating the number later and for the moment, I am confining myself to having it submitted. I couldn't present it any earlier because the picture didn't reach me; it certainly came through within the last days.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, go on.

BY DR. MARX:

Q When you considered the problem of the synagogues did you rely on any architectural experts and their opinion?

A I had frequent opportunities to discuss the subject with architects Every architect said that there had been counselers who had no architectural understanding--was incredible--this one was not in any way against the synagogue as a church; it was directed against such building in such a part of the city, and strangers whom I used to accompany during the Party rally days, even British and American people, used to cross the Hans Sachs square and look, and I said-- I remember one case where I said to somebody, "Aren't you noticing anything", and he didn't; but others stopped and said, quite frightened."How could that building get in amongst those medieval buildings?" I could submit a book, written in 1877, which is in the present library and where Professor Bernais, who was famous is writing to the authorin Switzerland that he had now seen the Hans Sachs Square

H0118 - 0016

Q Q Mr. Streicher, that is enough. In other words, you have indicated that you were relying on the judgment of expert architects and that you can refer to them?

A Yes.

Q At the time when the synagogue was dismantled, didyou make a speech?

A Yes, but I want to point out that the prosecution have submitted an article from a daily paper, that has been written by quite a simple young man, and I want to state that this article was not a true representation of the statements which I had made.

Q I now come to the demonstration during the 8th, 9th, and 10th of November 1938. What can you say about them and which part did you play in that connection? Were these demonstrations made by the population on their own initiative?

A Every year the Gauleiters and SA and SS leaders met the Fuehrer in Munich on the occasion of the historic day, the 9th of November--on the 9th of November we have sat down to dinner in the big hall of the Town Hall in Munich and it was customary that after dinner, the Fuehrer made a short speech. On the 9th of Novemb. 1938, I didn't feel so well. I did not participate in the dinner and then I left and returned to Nurnberg and I went to bed. It was midnight when I was awakened. My driver told me that the SA leader von Obernitz wants to talk to the Gauleiter. I received him and he said the following: "Gauleiter, you have already left and th Minister of Propaganda Dr Goebbels spoke ans said..." --If I can only repeat it approximately -- said "The Counsellor of the Embassy, von Rath, has been murdered in Paris; that it was already the second murder abroad in which a prominent Nazi was made the victim. This murder isn't the murder of the Jew Gruenspan; this is an action which has been designed by the entire Jewry and something would now have to be done." I don't know whether Goebbels said the Fuehrer ordered it, but I only remember that from Obernitz-- He told me that Goebells had stated that synagogues were to be set on fire and I cannot now remember exactly but I think he also told me that Jewish businesses, too, had to have their windows smashed and that houses should be demolished. So I said to Obernitz, because I was surprised, Of course-- I said, "Obernitz, I thik it is wrong that synagogues should be set on fire and at this moment I think it is wrong that Jewish businesses should be demolished. I think this demonstration is wrong. If people are let loose during the night, perpetrations may happen for which one cannot take responsibility." And I said to Obernitz, in particular, "The setting on fire of synagogues is considered wrong by me

H0118 - 0017

because abroad and also in amongst the German people, the opinion might be formed that National Socialism had now started the fight against religion." Obernitz replied "I have the order." I said "Obernitz, I will not assume resposibility in this connection." Obernitz left and the deed happened. The thing which I have said under oath, it has already been stated by me during several interrogations. My driver will confirm it, who had knowledge of this night and was a witness to it. Shortly afterwards, when he went to bed, he said to his wife what he had heard up there in my bedroom.

Q Have you finished?

A Yes, but you had asked another question.

Q Oh, yes; was the action spontaneous; did it come from the people, did it, or their own initiative?

A In the National Socialist press, after the action there appeared a similar article, which stated that a spontaneous action of the population had revenged the murder of von Rath. It had therefore been deliberately ordered from Berlin that there should be a public statement, that the demonstrations of 1938 had been spontaneous; that this was so, that this is something which I have been able to experience in Nurnberg and it is remarkable that the dislike for what had happened during those demonstrations expressed itself in that year in Nurnberg, right down it went to the Party members. The prosecution has submitted an article which is a report about a speech which I had made on the 10th of November and that is a remarkable piece of evidence for the fact that the people were against this action. I was forced, because of the atmosphere which prevailed in Nurnberg, to make a public speech and say that one should not have so much sympathy and pity for the Jews. That is how the matter happened in November 1938. Perhaps it might be important that you should ask me how it is, that is, how those people should have turned down the idea of that demonstration.

H0118-0018

Q I thought you had explained that. Who gave the order for the burning down of the synagogue on Essenwein Strasse?

A I don't know who gave the order. I believe it was the SA leader von Obernitz. I don't know the details.

Q Next question: Did you yourself express the fact publicly that you disliked these measures?

A Yes. Amongst leading Party members I said what I have always said publicly, and stated that this was wrong. I talked before lawyers during a meeting. I don't know whether my defense counsel was there. I believe it was still in November 1938 that I spoke before the Nurnberg lawyers at a meeting and said that what had happened herein during that action, was wrong; it was a wrong done to the people and it was wrong before the countries abroad, and I said that anyone who knew the Jewish question as well as I did would understand why I considered that demonstration a mistake.

I don't know whether this was reported to the Fuehrer at that time, but after November 1938 I was never again called by him when the Fuehrer came to Nurnberg, when he came to stay at the Hotel Deutscher Hof. I don't know whether this was the reason, but at any rate, I criticized these demonstrations publicl

Q It is assumed by the Prosecution that in 1938 more severe treatment of Jews was introduced, Is this true, and what is the explanation?

A In 1938 the Jewish question entered a new phase. That was shown by that demonstration. I myself can only say that as far as I know there was no preliminary conference. I assumed that it was done quite impulsively as the Fuehrer would do it, acting on the spur of the moment. Probably as late as the 9th of November, he got around to saying to Dr. Goebbels, "The synagagues must be burned down." As I said, I myself didn't attend such a meeting, and I don't know what happened to bring about this acceleration.

Q On the 12th of November 1938, the decree was published according to which the Jews were to be eliminated from the economic life of the country. Was there a connection between the orders of the 9th and that decree of the 12th, and would that connection be due to the ssame reason?

A I can only say that I am convinced that there was a connection. The decrees which referred to the economic field came from Berlin. We didn't have

H0118 - 0019

any conferences. I just don't remember any Gauleiter meetings in which that was discussed. That happened just as everything happened; we weren't previouly informed.

Q How was it that not you, but the defendant Rosenberg was given the task of looking after the question?

A Rosenberg was the spiritual trustee of the movement, but he hadn't been given this particular task. He had been given neither the task of this demonstration nor economic tasks.

Q I think Rosenberg had given the task, by the leaders of the State, of taking care of the enlightenment on racial-political grounds. It wasn't you, was it? How can that be explained? How can it be explained that you weren't choosen?

A Rosenberg, as he himself said, met the Fuehrer very early, and intellectually, and because of his knowledge, he was suited to take on this job. I devoted myself to popular enlightenment.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, he has told us that he wasn't given the task. Unless he had some communication with Rosenberg he can't tell us anything more about it except that he wasn't given the task. All the rest is mere comment and argument.

DR. MARX: Yes.

BY DR. MARX:

Q I now put the next question to you: Was there, during the year of 1939 an order issued that you mustn't speak?

A Yes. In the autumn of 1939, my enemies at last achieved that the Fuehrer, without asking me previously, and through Party Member Hess, issued a written order stopping me from making speeches. The threat of immediate arrest was contained therein, if I should infringe this order.

Q Isn't it also correct that in 1938 there even seemed to be an inclination to stop the publication of the Stuermer - I mean in Government circles?

A Such intentions existed quite often, and perhaps I should refer to two documents in this connection to save time.

The Prosecution has submitted copies of a letter of Himmler and Baldur von Schirach, and I can give an explanation right now. At that time, in 1939, there were intentions of prohibiting the Stuermer. Bormann had even issued some such order, and that chief editor of the Stuermer was writing to prominent members

H0118-0020

of the Party, asking them to state their opinion about the Stuermer, and letters were received from Himmler and von Schirach Altogether, I think about 15 letters were received from prominent members of the movement, and they were merely kind replies to my inquiries.

Q Is it true that at the outbreak of war you were not made Armed Forces District Commissioner in your Gau?

A Yes.

Q And how can that be explained?

A Oh well, maybe that isn't quite so important. That is how conditions were at the time. There were certain personal attitudes. It is of no significance. At any rate, I didn't become an Armed Forces District Commissioner.

Q The Prosecution has stated that after the first of September 1939, the persecution of the Jews increased more and more. What do you think that was due to?

A That question could only be answered by the Fuehrer, not by me.

Q But don't you think it had something to do with the outbreak of war?

A Well, the Fuehrer said so repeatedly, publicly, yes.

Q Before the Supreme Party Court, proceedings were instituted against you. How did that happen? What was the outcome, and the result of that trial?

A I am grateful that I have an opportunity to state quite briefly before this International Military Tribunal something which I had to keep silent about up to now because of the Fuehrer Order. I myself had introduced proceedings against myself before the Supreme Party Court so as to defend myself against people who were denouncing me. I was being accused --

THE PRESIDENT (Interposing): Is the defendant talking about some order which Hitler gave that he was not to be allowed to spea or is he talking about something else?

H0118-0021

You remember, Dr. Marx, that certain allegations were struck out of the record. If he is talking about those, it seems to me that we have got nothing whatever to do with it. Am I not right in recollecting that something was struck out of the record?

DR. MARX: Yes, Mr. President, but only one passage from the Goering Report was left out, which was one dealing with that affair referring to the three young persons, but everything else was maintained by the Prosecution, and the Defense, therefore, must refer to these points. The Prosecution didn't say, of course, that they were dropping the entire Goering report, and in that connection these proceedings before the Supreme Party Court play an important part. He can make a brief statement on it.

THE PRESIDENT: All right.

DR. MARX: And I can so direct him.

BY DR. MARX:

Q Be brief, witness, be brief.

A It was important that I instituted proceedings against myself. There were about ten points which had been raised against me, and among them was a matter referring to some shares, and an affidavit existed which stated that I had been sentenced. May I state here that the trial was never completed and no sentence was passed.

That is the answer to the question which you put to me.

Q That share business, is that something with reference to shares of the Marx works? Of course, we'll come to that later.

And then you were ordered to the Pleikerthof?

H0118-0022

A I was ordered to stay on the farm and I had the intention never again to voluntarily be active in the Party movement and what is correct is that the Gestapo did supervise, did watch me and every visitor was called to the police station and interrogated regarding the discussion which they had. That is a fact.

Q Once you were at the Pleikerthof did you have any connections, say in writing, with any leading personalities in the Party or state?

A No. As far as prominent persons in the movement and in the state is concerned I had no written contact with them and that is why the Prosecution could hardly find any letters. I never referred to the Jewish problem in writing or any such matters. So as to your question exactly, I shall have to state I have had no contact or correspondence with prominent persons in the Party or the state.

Q Were you informed of any intended measures against the Jews after the outbreak of war or were you consulted on these questions?

A No.

Q What was your relationship to Himmler? Did you know him at all closely? Did you discuss measures against the Jews with him at any time or did he talk about intended mass executions?

A I knew Himmler just as I knew the SA or SS leaders. I knew him from joint meetings and rallies, Gauleiter conferences. On no occasion did I have a political discussion with Himmler. He then, once or twice in the presence of others, touched upon this matter or the other. The last time I saw Himmler was in Nurnberg when he spoke before officers in the Casino, the officers' mess. When that was I cannot say exactly but I think it was shortly before the war. I never had a talk about the Jewish problems with him, he himself was enlightened. He had an organ of his own called the "Black Corps".

What his inner attitude toward me was, that is something I discovered when I was still on my farm. There were denunciation against me which reached him. It was stated that I was being too humane to French prisoners of war and shortly after that I received a letter, in which he blamed me, seriously accused me and I did not answer. He made no previous inquiries and asked me whether these denunciation were true but he was accusing me

H0118 - 0023

seriously and I am stating quite openly that it was my feeling at the time that it might be quite possible that even I might lose my liberty and be arrested. That was my relationship to Himmler.

Q That is enough.

During this trial a number of higher SS and police leaders were mentioned who played a leading part in the Jewish persecutions, as for instance, Heydrich, Eichmann, Ohlendorf and so on. Were there any connections between you and one of those higher SS and police leaders?

A The names which you have mentioned were heard by me for the first time here during interrogations. I did not know these gentlemen. They probably saw me but there was no contact between myself and the higher SS and police leaders. There had never been a conference nor had I ever gone to any of Himmler's offices or any ministry in Berlin so that there were never any discussions or conferences.

Q The Prosecution have drawn the conclusion from numerous articles in the Stuermer that as early as 1942 and 1943 you had knowledge of the mass executions of Jews which had taken place and I should like you to make a statement on the subject and tell us when and in which way you heard of these mass executions which had taken place in the east.

A I had subscribed to the Israelitic weekly appearing in Switzerland. Sometimes that weekly journal contained hints that something was not quite in order somewhere and I think it was at the end of '43 or 1944 that an article appeared in this Jewish weekly, in which it said that in the east, I think it was Poland, masses of Jews were disappearing. The article to which I am referring will probably be presented here but I am stating quite frankly that these Israelitic weeklies in Switzerland did not represent an authoratiative source to me. It did not quote figures; it did not talk about mass executions; it just mentioned disappearances.

Q Have you finished?

A Yes.

Q Did you make a proposal in the Stuermer about the solution of the Jewish question and did that go even during the war?

A Yes.

Q And in what sense?

H0118 - 0024

A As I have already said yesterday, I represented the point of view that the Jewish question can only be solved internationally since there were Jews amongst all the nations. For that reason we were publishing articles in my weekly journal referring to the Zionist demand that a Jewish state should be created, as it had been proposed in the Balfour declaration. There were therefore, two possibilities as to a preliminary solution amongst the nations and then there was the creation of a Jewish state. During the war, I think it was in 1941 or 1942, we had written another article which was to be censored in Berlin and the draft, which had been submitted, was returned by the censor with the remark that the article must not be published since it was proposing Madagascar as the location for the Jewish state. The political relations with France were given as the reason why that article should not be published.

Q If, therefore, you had expected that question to be solved by mass executions would you have written that article?

A At that time it would have been nonsensical to write it.

Q Weren't you wondering about the fact that you were dealing with the Jewish question from a biased standpoint? Did you not consider that those qualities of the Jews which are described as great were completely ignored by you?

A I did not understand the question. Perhaps I did not hear it quite clearly.

Q You can be accused that you were only reporting the biased, one-sided qualities of the Jews whereas the other qualities of the Jewish people were not being discussed by you. What is the explanation?

A I think that that question is really superfluous. It is a perfectly natural affair that I, as an anti-semitic person and considering how I learned about the Jews, was in no way interested in doing that. Perhaps the advantages which you or some others might recognize in the Jews were not recognized by me, that is possible. But at any rate I was not interested in making research which might show particular advantages one might ascertain in that connection.

THE PRESIDENT: This would seem a good time to break off.

(A recess was taken)

H0118 - 0025

Q. Did you visit concentration camps?

A. Yes. I visited the concentration camp at Dachau.

Q. When was that?

A. I believe the first time on the occasion that all gauleiters were called together. I believe 1935 or so. I don't know for sure -- 1934 or 1935 or 1933 -- I don't know.

Q. At what intervals did you then visit these camps. It is said that every four weeks you had been in Dachau. Mr. Streicher, always will you make a short pause after my question and only then begin with your answer?

A. Will you repeat?

Q. It is asserted that you had been in Dachau every four weeks. What were the intervals between your visits?

A. Altogether I was four times at Dachau.

Q. It has been asserted that after each of your visits in Dachau, that after that date Jews disappeared.

A. That I don't know -- whether Jews disappeared.

Q. What caused you to visit Dachau repeatedly?

A. I went to Dachau to visit in prison social democratic and communistic functionaries -- to have them introduced to me, and I don't know how many hundreds of them. Every time when I was in Dachau I saw to it that a number, ten or twenty, were selected, of whom it had been found out by the police that they had no criminal sentences -- no previous criminal sentences. I selected them from the entire number and then, at Christmas of every year, I had them brought to Nurnberg into the Hotel Deutscher Hof, where I brought them together with their wives and children and gave them a communal dinner. They were quartered and took part in a dinner. I should like to add to the Tribunal for the benefit of the people of Nurnberg that I may be permitted to make a statement as to why I took these communists out. I was brought into Party proceedings because I did that. There are certain rumors which are not true. May I therefore make a short statement as to why I did it?

DR. MARX: I would like to ask the Tribunal to approve, Mr. President, so that the reasons why the Defendant --

H0118 - 0026

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, as long as it is brief.

Q. Yes, please be brief.

A. When I walked through the streets of Nurnberg children approached me and said, "My father is in Dachau." Women came and asked to get their Husbands back. I knew many of these officials from the time when they spoke in discussions with revolutionary meetings, and for these people I could vouch. I know only one case where I was wrong in the selection of those people. All the others kept their word which they gave me, and there are the other Party members who are sitting here in the dock who see that I did not want to harm my country but that I wanted to commit humane acts, and did so.

Q. Now I come to the picture books which appeared in the Stuermer publishing house. You know that two picture books were published, one with the title "Do not Trust the Fox in the Field", and the other one with the title "The Poisoned Mushroom." Do you assume responsibility for these picture books?

A. Yes. May I say in conclusion that for everything which was written by my assistants or which came from the outside to my paper I assume responsibility.

Q. Who was the author of these picture books?

A. The book "Don't Trust the Fox in the Field and No Jew Under His Oath" was done by a young girl artist. She made the drawings and also the texts. The title is by Dr. Martin Luther.

The second picture book was made by the editor-in-chief of the Stuermer, who before had been a teacher. The reason for publishing these two books was that there had occurred two criminal cases in Nurnberg which had been tried here in this courtroom, as much as I know. There was a manufacturer, Louis Schloss.

Q. Mr. Streicher, we do not want to hear that now. My question was only as to who was the author of these books and whether you assumed the responsibility for these two books.

A. It is for the Tribunal of importance, of course, to know how it came about that all of a sudden two picture books appeared, and I am only speaking here of court cases. There are gentlemen here who could testify to it who were

H0118-0027

here in this court and were present during the proceedings. Only thus can one understand why these books were published. They were the answers to facts that had occurred.

Q. Yes, but only deal with the accusations made against you, that by doing so the minds of youths were impressed in a way which was neither necessary nor beneficial, but poisoning.

A. I would like to prove by my statements that we wanted to protect youth, because facts had occurred.

Q. Yes, but you could hardly understand the case Schloss.

A. No, there were public discussions in Nurnberg, and beyond that all throughout Germany.

Q. As far as I am concerned, this question is answered, Mr. President.

A. But for me as Defendant.

THE PRESIDENT: You told us that the books were published to answer facts which had occurred here. That is sufficient.

Q. Witness, another serious accusation made by the Prosecution against you is that a special issue concerning ritual murders had been published in the firm of the Stuermer and also appeared in the Stuermer. How did this special issue come about and what was the cause for it. Were you the author of that special issue.

A. No.

Q. Who was the author?

A. My collaborator, editor-in-chief at that time, Karl Holz. But I assume the responsibility.

Q. Wasn't it so that already during the 20's you dealt with that question in the Stuermer?

A. Yes; and in public speeches.

Q. Yes. Had you published these. This very serious affair in 1935, again --

A. I should like to ask my counsel to express no judgment about what I have written. You can ask me but you cannot judge. The Prosecution is going to do that. You have asked me how this issue came about. I will explain briefly.

H0118-0028

DR. MARX: Excuse me. Mr. President, I have to protest with the fact that Mr. Streicher here, in the course of his interrogation by me criticizes the manner in which I put my questions. Therefore, I ask for the permission of the court to state my position about it, because otherwise I could not ask my questions.

THE PRESIDENT: You have already stated your position and the Tribunal has given you full support in your position. Will you please continue?

And let me tell you this Defendant, that if you are insolent to your counsel or to the Tribunal the Tribunal will not be able to continue the hearing of your case at this moment. You will kindly treat your counsel and the Tribunal with due courtesy.

THE WITNESS: May I ask to say something about this? I want to repeat my question.

THE PRESIDENT: No. Answer the questions, please.

BY DR. MARX:

Q. The Prosecution, concerning that ritual murder story, accuses you that without materials you treated the whole thing, and only referring to a story out of the Middle Ages. What, in brief, was your source?

A. In that issue the sources are mentioned. Nothing was published without at the same time giving the source. It indicated that there was a book written by a former rabbi who had been converted to Christianity, in the Greek language. We found out that there had been a publication by a high clergyman of Milan, a book which appeard in Germany for the last fifty years, and also under the democratic government Jews have not complained about that book.

That ritual murder issue refers to court files which are located in Rome -- files which are at court. There are pictures which show that in twenty-three cases the church itself has dealt with that question -- twenty-three cases where non-Jews had been killed by ritual murder. They had been sacrificed Pictures and sculpture were shown as illustrations, and also the source was pointed out. Even a case in England was mentioned, and one in Kiev, Russia.

H0118-0029

But in that connection I should like to say, as I have told it to the Jewish officer here, that we never wanted to assert that all of Jewry were ready to commit ritual murders. But it is a fact that within Judah the sect exists which committed these murders, and until recently I have asked my counsel that he should submit to the Court the file of Piseck in Czechoslovakia, where recently a court of appeal has confirmed a case of ritual murder.

MR. JUSTICE JACKSON: I object to this statement, your Honor. After his Counsel has refused to submit it, the witness insists on stating here the contents of a court record. This is not an orderly way to make charges against the Jewish people. Streicher says he is asking Counsel to submit. His Counsel apparently has refused, whereupon he starts to give evidence that he knows in any case is a resume of the matters which his Counsel has declined to submit here. It seems to me that having appointed Counsel to conduct his case, he has shown repeatedly that he is not willing to conduct his case in an orderly manner. He ought to be returned to his cell and any further statements that he wishes to make to this Court transmitted through his Counsel in writing. This is entirely unfair and contemptuous of the Court.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, I think you better continue.

DR. MARX: I should like to say that that closes this affair The essential thing is that all that can be said is that he treated the case without material, without sources. The Defense is not interested in that any further. According to my recollection, I also suggested to a gentleman of the Prosecution, if possible, to leave out that one matter, because it is possible that the matter is so gruesome and so horrible that it is better not to treat it. But the Defendant only wanted to say that only on the basis of various materials he dealt with the case, and I believe that is sufficient. That would close the matter.

H0118-0030

Q Now, Mr. Streicher, again and again I have mentioned the mistake that you go too far in your explanations and that you discuss things which may be called propaganda on your part. I should like to ask you for the last time to stick to the answering of my questions and leave out anything unnecessary and in your own interests. You have been accused that in your district you repeatedly committed acts which were crimes against humanity, mistreatment of people who lived in your Gau, and you are also accused specifically that you mistreated the political prisoner, a man of the name of Steinruch, that you visited him in his cell and beat him there. Is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Was Steinruch a Jew?

A No.

Q For what reason did you do that?

A Steinruch in a public place had made statements before many witnesses, derogatory statements about the Fuehrer, libelous statements. He was at police headquarters and I had spoken to the police president about it and told him that I should like to look at that Steinruch once and to go with my adjutant. The Goering report says that a party member, Holz, was there too, but that is not correct. I went with my adjutant to police headquarters and the same police president who later denounced me to the Reichsmarschall in the Goering report guided me to Steinruch's cell.

We went into the cell, and I state clearly that I went there with the intention of talking to the man reasonably. I talked to him, but he acted so cowardly that on the spur of the moment he had to be hit. I do not mind telling you here that I am sorry about that case, that I have to state that I was slippin

Q Then it is asserted that in August, 1938, you had hit another fellow.

A No, that is not correct. If I had hit hi[illegible], then I

H0118-0031

would say so, but I believe that my adjutant and somebody else may have had an argument with him.

Q What about the incident in the Kuenstlerhaus in Munich?

A I came to Munich and into the place called Kuenstlerstaette, or something like that. I was received by the manager and at that moment a young fellow who was terribly drunk approached me and shouted, and the manager protested

H0118 - 0032

against it and told him to go away. But the drunken young fellow came back again and my chauffeur grabbed him. My son helped him. They walked him into another room and beat him up and then the owner of the inn thanked me that he had peace from that drunk now.

And how I should like the Tribunal's permission that I may very briefly say something about that one case which I believe the Prosecution also has dropped, where I was accused of saddistic tendencies --

THE PRESIDENT: You know perfectly well that that incident has been stricken from the record and is not, therefore, emntioned against you, so that it is quite unnecessary to go into it. The Tribunal cannot hear you on it.

Q Now, from the so-called Goering report I should like to put up to you some points which have been mentioned by the Prosecution. You know that after the action of November, 1938, in the district of Francsnia, Aryanization of Jewish property took place to a large extent. Would you like to make a statement about that?

A There in the Goering report is the reference to a statement of the deceased Party member, Holz. In that statement it is pointed out that Holz after that action had come to see me, had a report to make about the action, also considered that action wrong, and further, had said, "Now that has happened, we consider it necessary to go further and Aryanize the property". The Goering report states that I had told Holz that could not be done and I had refused to do it. Then it says again, Holz had told me that he thought it would be right if he would do it, we could also get means for the establishment of a district school - Gauschule - out of it. Furthermore, Holz declared that I had said, "Well, Holz, if you believe you can do it, then go ahead and do it." I want to state here that this is true, what Party member Holz confessed. I rejected the idea at first and then out of a sudden impulse, which I cannot understand today, I said, "Well, if you can do it, then go ahead and do it." I want to state now and here that at that time when I said it I did not really believe that it should be done or could be done; but it happened, and the Reichsmarschall as Plenipotentiary for the four-year plan later stated his position on it in Berlin and rejected it. Then I found out exactly how Holz took care of that Aryanization. I had a talk with him and a serious dispute, and our friendly relations were broken. He went to a Panzer

H0118 - 0033

outfit at the Front. I returned from Berlin to Nurnberg and later there in Nurnberg the Reichsmarschall sent a criminal commissar to Nurnberg. He reported to me and asked me if I had approved that the whole matter should be investigated and I stated that I would welcome such an investigation. The investigation took place, Aryanization was repealed and it was stated that Holz personnally had not had any material advantage out of it, and the government itself took care of Aryanization. I state frankly that in that affair I am at least guilty of negligence.

H0118 - 0034

Q Did you know that the amounts paid on the occasion of Aryanization of property or real estate represented only about twenty per cent, or less, of the actual value?

A Holz had not come to see me for weeks. He did the Aryanization in the office of the Labor front with the officials there, and in Berlin later, during the meeting with the Reichsmarshal, I found out the true facts. Therefore, we had a dispute, Holz and myself, and a break in relations because I had to reject the manner in which Aryanization had been taken care of.

Q Furthermore, you are accused, for purposes of personal enrichment, of having acquired shares of the Mars Works at Nurnberg at an extraordinarily low price and that in the course of the acquisition, a certain pressure was exerted on the owner of the shares.

A It says in the Goering report literally that I had given an order and in another place that I had given a specific command to acquire the Mars shares for myself. I state here that I neither gave an order nor a specific command to acquire the Mars shares.

The whole thing occurred thus: My chief of the publishing firm had power of attorney because I personally never, through all the years, bothered with financial or business matters, and he had a power of attorney and he could do what he wanted. One day he came to see me with my adjutant. Now, I do not recollect whether the adjutant was the one who spoke or the manager of the firm. I was told the following: An attorney had called and said that the Mars Works shares were offered for sale at a very low price and would I agree to it. I said that never before in my life had I owned any shares, that I never bothered about financial matters in my publishing firm and that if the thought that he should acquire those shares, then he could do it. The shares were bought It was the most severe breech of confidence which was ever committed by any one of my assistants or Party Members. After a short time, I was informed as to how these shares had been acquired. I found out that the owner had been threatened. When I found out under what conditions the purchase had been made, I gave the order at once to return the shares.

H0118-0035

In the Goering report it states that they were returned. Among the confiscated shares of my publishing business, there is an official statement, a document, about that affair which shows that these shares had been returned.

In this connection, maybe I am permitted to say that my publishing firm, until the end of the war, was in a private house. At the time of the Aryanization, somebody approached me, saying that for my publishing firm, one could easily acquire an Aryanized house. I refused that, and I state here in conclusion that I have in my possession nothing from Jewish property.

When that demonstration occurred in 1938, jewels had been brought in to the Gass house. These pieces of jewelry were turned over to the police. A man who was the holder of the Honorary Party Emblem was convicted and sentenced to six years because he took a ring and another piece of jewelry and gave it to his girl friend.

H0118-0036

I may add one thing: that the fault when wearers of Party Emblems did things like that rests perhaps with those who gave the order, "Go to the Jewish houses now."

The man, as much as I knew him, had always been personally decent, but here, on the basis of that order, he came into a position where he committed the crime.

I have finished what I wanted to say.

Q Was it not true that the accusations made by the manager of the publishing firm, Fink, before the Party, even before the police interrogation, were different in the main points from what you have told us now?

A: The whole thing was that Fink, the manager, had been called to police headquarters and interrogated. The police president was very much interested in the interrogation since for many years he had been a friend of mine and frequently visited me in my house. Fink came from that interrogation very much excited. He paced up and down in front of me and shouted loudly, "I was threatened. I have made statements which are not true. I am a heel. I am a criminal." A witness of that incident was my chauffeur. I calmed him down and told him, "I have been interrogated once also. I was even imprisoned once."

THE PRESIDENT: Is it necessary to go in such detail into this matter?

DR. MARX: Well, excuse me, Mr. President. Perhaps this would be essential because in this report, reference is made to the testimony of Fink, and it is attempted to prove that the explanations made by Streicher are wrong, that he gave the order to purchase these shares and possibly under threats, and that he ordered and approved it, whereas he says that he neither knew that these shares were bought at such a low price, nor that pressure, blackmail, was used on that occasion.

If that is not important, then, of course, we can close the matter.

H0118-0037

THE PRESIDENT: That is what he has already said. He has said that quite clearly, has he not. I was only suggesting that it was not necessary to go into such detail on the matter.

Q Witness, it may be of some importance to state what the development of the Sturmer was since 1933, as far as circulation is concerned. Can you give us a short description about the circulation of the Sturmer and then I shall put another question to you.

A The Sturmer appeared in 1923 in small size, and in the beginning, it had a circulation of 2,000 to 3,000 copies. Later the circulation increased to 10,000. At that time the Sturmer was, until 1933, really only in Nurnberg, in my gau, my district, and possibly also in Southern Bavaria. The publisher was a man who owned a bookshop and he did the whole work with one man in the beginning, then with two, and that is proof for the fact that circulation was very small.

In 1933--and I say this with certain reservations because it may be that the publisher did not always tell me the correct figures and I had no written contract with him--I say with reservations that in 1933 I believe the circulation was 25,000 copies.

In 1935 the publisher died, and at that time it was, I believe 40,000. Then the firm came into the hands of an expert, and he re-organized it to cover all of Germany. The circulation increased to 100,000, and up as high as 600,000. It fluctuated, went back and dropped during the war. I could not say correctly, but I believe it was to about 150,000 to 200,000.

Q You said that a new man re-organized it to cover all of Germany. On that occasion, for that purpose, was the Party machinery utilized, and were there not industries and other groups--the German Labor Front--which were utilized in order to increase the circulation forcibly?

H0118-0038

A Well, the attitude of the Party was manifested by a letter, which was sent to all Gaus or districts, signed by Bormann. There it was expressly pointed out that the Stuermer was not a party organ, it had nothing to do with the Party. Thereupon several Gauleiters found it necessary to order that the Stuermer could not appear in their Gaus any more.

Now, within the organizations there were Party members who, out of idealism or for other reasons, were interested and who intervened for the distribution of the Stuermer; that is clear. However, I myself, neither in writing nor orally, have even given any order to any Party organization in support of the Stuermer.

Q Mr. Streicher, before 1933 you had been before the courts repeatedly because of your articles and your attitude manifested in the Stuermer. Would you give us a short explanation of how often that occurred and what the consequences were for you?

A How often? I could not answer that today, but it was frequently; I was frequently before the courts.

You ask me about the consequences. I was repeatedly in jail, but I may say proudly that in those sentences it stated, in many cases, " an incorruptible fanatic of the truth."

That was the consequence of my activity as a speaker and writer, but perhaps it is important to state the following: I never came before a court on account of criminal charges, but only because of my anti-Semitic activities. The people who made the charges were members of an organization of citizens of the Jewish faith. The Chairman said the following repeatedly when we slipped so far as language was concerned and therefore brought about a possibility of being brought before a court because of certain existing laws. I want to point out here that the Jewish Justizrat, Dr. Sisheim, the attorney who was my opponent, stated before the Court here in this courtroom, "Gentlemen of the Tribunal, he is our unfailing enemy, but he is a fanatic for the truth. He is convinced of what he does; he is honest about it."

THE PRESIDENT: What years were they that you were repeatedly in jail?

H0118 - 0039

THE WITNESS: That was, of course, before 1933. The first time I came to Landsberg, to prison, because I took part if the Hitler Putsch. Then I got three and a half months here in this jail in Nurnberg where I am now. Then I got three months--

THE PRESIDENT: You needn't bother with the details.

THE WITNESS: That is to say, before 1933 I was repeatedly sentenced to jail or fined.

DR. MARX: Mr. President, the Goering report also mentions the fact that the defendant Streicher personally was interested in certain Jewish industries in order to get some capital out of them. However, I am of the opinion that it is not essential to deal with these points. The same applies to the fact that the Bodensee--Lake of Constance--was sold, and to whom. I do not know whether the defendant should make any statements about this here. In my opinion there is no cause to ask him any questions concerning that.

THE PRESIDENT: I think you could leave that and see whether it is taken up in cross-examination. If it is, then you may re-examine him.

DR. MARX: Yes, certainly.

Mr. President, this concludes my questions to the defendant.

THE PRESIDENT: Do any members of defendants' counsel wish to ask questions of the defendant?

(No response)

The prosecution?

H0118-0040

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q If the Tribunal please.

When you handed over your Party to Hitler in 1922, did you know his policy and what was to become the policy of the Nazi Party?

A The policy--I should like to say first, "no". At that time one could not see things which were not even possible in our minds. The policy was to create a new faith for the German people, a faith which would negate the chaos and disorder and which would bring about a return to order.

Q May I take it that within a short course of time you knew the policy, the policy according to the Party program and according to Mein Kampf?

A I did not need a Party program. I admit frankly that I never read it in its entirety. At that time programs were not important, but mass demonstrations--

THE PRESIDENT: Answer the question. The question was whether, a short time after 1922, you knew the policy as indicated in the Party program and in Mein Kampf.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q You knew, did you not, that the policy included the Anschluss with Austria? Can you answer that yes or no?

A No. There was never anything mentioned of Austria. I do not remember that the Fuehrer ever spoke about the fact that Austria should be annexed.

A I only want you to answer my question. My question was: Did you know that the Fuehrer's policy was the annexation of Austria to Germany? I understand your answer to be "no". Is that correct?

A That he intended it? No, that I do not know.

Q Did you know that he intended to take over Czechoslovaki

H0118-0041

or at least the Sudetenland?

A No.

Q Did you know that from the start in Mein Kampf his ultimate objective was Lebensraum?

A What I have read in Mein Kampf is marked in red. The book has been confiscated. I read only that which concerns the Jewish question; I did not read anything else. However, that we had to acquire Lebensraum for our people, that goes without saying. I personally had that aim, to contribute in whatever way for a better future for a large number of people.

Q May I take it that during the year 1922, until 1923, as editor and owner of the Stuermer, and as a Gauleiter from 1925, you did everything you could to put the Nazi Party into power?

A Yes; that is a matter of course.

Q And after 1933 did you continuously support and issue propaganda on behalf of the Nazi Party policy?

A Yes.

Q Not only in respect of the Jewish question, but of the foreign policy as well?

A No, that is not correct. In the Stuermer you would not find a single article which deals with foreign policy. And--

Q That is quite enough. I am not going to occupy very much time over this matter. However, I would ask you to look at D-802.

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: My Lord, this is a new exhibit.

THE PRESIDENT: Which will be what?

COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: GB-327.

My Lord, I am sorry, but the document seems to be missing for the moment. Perhaps I might read the extract.

BY COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES:

Q Let me just read you an extract from an article which you wrote in the Stuermer of March 1938, immediately after the

H0118 - 0042

Anschluss with Austria. I want you to tell me whether or not you are advocating the Nazi policy in regard to Austria:

"We must make sure that the power of the Jews does not grow up to heaven itself. What was only a dream up to a few days ago has now become a reality. The sister nation of Austria has returned home to the Reich."

And then, a few lines further down:

H0118 -0043

"We are approaching wonderful times, a greater Germany without Jews."

Do you say that you are not there issuing propagandaon behalf of the Nazi policy?

A I have not issued propaganda policies. Austria was already annexed. I just welcomed the fact. I did not need to make any more propaganda about it.

Q Very well. Perhaps you'll tell me what you mean by the "greater Germany" that you are approaching. What greater Germany are you approaching in March, 1938, a Germany greater than it was after the Anschluss with Austria?

A A greater Germany (Grosse Deutschland), a living area in which all people who speak Germany or are of German blood could live together.

Q Do I understand that you are advocating "Lebensraum", greater space, n ot yet advocated by Germany?

A At first not, no. At first we only dealt with Austria and Germany. The Austrians are Germans and, therefore, belong into a greater Germany.

Q I won't argue with you. I will just ask you once more, what do you mean by the "greater Germany" that you are approaching in March of 1938?

A I said that already, a Germany where all those can live and work together who speak German and have German blood.

Q Would you look at D-118, which will become GB-238. Perhaps I can carry on. In November of 1938, after Munich, did you, yourself, personally send a telegram to Conrad Henlein, the leader of the Sudeten-German Party?

A If it says so there, then that will be true. I do not recall it.

Q Let me refresh your recollection as to what you said.

"Without your courageous preparatorywork the great act would not have succeeded."

Are you there advocating and issuing propaganda in support of the policy of the Nazi Government?

A I have to ask you again, would you please repeat your question?

Q I am asking you whether or not that telegram, which you sent to Conrad Henlein and reprinted in your newspaper under a picture of that gentleman -- I am asking you whether or not that was propaganda in support of the Nazi policy, Nazi foreign policy?

H0118 - 0044

A I have to say the same about this as I said before. That was a telegram of Frank's. I did not have to make any more propaganda because the Munich agreement had already taken place.

Q I put it to you and I'll leave it. I'll put it to you that throughout the years from 1933 until 1944 or 1945 you were in fact doing everything you could to support the policy of the Government, both domestically and in regard to its foreign affairs.

A As far as possible within my province, yes.

Q I want to turn now to the question of the Jews. May I remind you of the speech which you made on the 1st of April, 1933, that is to say, the day of the boycott.

My Lord, this will be found in the original document book, M-33. It was not actually put in before. It now becomes GB-329.

I shall hand you a--

THE PRESIDENT: M- What was it?

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: M-33. It is in the document book on page 15, in the original document book which the Tribunal have.

BY LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q Now, I give you the document book. If you want to see the original, you may do so in every case.

"For fourteen years", you say, " we have been repeating in Germany 'German people, learn to recognize your true enemy', and the German simpletons listened carefully and then declared that we preached religious hatred. Never since the beginning of the world and the creation of man has there been a nation which dared to fight against the nation of blood-suckers and extortioner who, for a thousand years, have spread all over the world."

And then I go down to the last line of the next paragraph.

"It was left to our movement to expose the eternal Jew as a mass murderer."

Is it right that for fourteen years you had been repeating in Germany "German people, learn to recognize your true enemy"?

A I would like to state that what you gave me here has nothing to do with it. You gave me a —

H0118 - 0045

THE PRESIDENT: You are asked a question. You are asked whether it is true that for fourteen years you had been repeating to Germany "Learn to recognize your true enemy." Is that true?

THE WITNESS: That I did, yes.

BY LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q And in doing so, is it true that you had been preaching religious hatred?

A No.

Q Will you look at --

A Can I be permitted to make a statement concerning that answer? In my weekly "Der Stuermer" I have repeatedly stated that for me the Jews are not a religious group but a race, a people.

Q And do you think to call them "blood-suckers, a nation of blood-suckers and extortioners" -- do you think that's preaching hatred?

A I beg your pardon. I have to say I did not quite understand it.

Q You may call them a race or a nation, whichever you like, now, but you were saying on the 1st April, 1933, that they were a "nation of blood-suckers and extortioners." Do you call that preaching hatred?

A That is a statement of facts, an expression of a conviction which can be proved on the basis of historical facts.

Q Understand me. I did not ask you whether or not it was a fact; I asked you whether you called it preaching hatred. Your answer is yes or no.

A No, it's not preaching hatred; it's just a statement of facts.

Q Will you look two pages further on in that last exhibit M-33, and do you see the fourth paragraph from the end of the extract? That is page 17 of the document book.

"So long as I stand at the head of the struggle, this struggle will be conducted so thoroughly that the external Jew will deprive no joy from it."

A That I wrote; that was right.

Q And you were, were you not, one of those who did stand and continue to stand at the head of that struggle?

A At the head? Whether I stood at the head? Oh, I'm too modest. But I assume that clearly and frankly I spoke about my convictions and about

H0118 - 0046

my knowledge.

Q Why did you say that so long as you were at thehead of it, the Jew will deprive no joy from it?

A Because I considered myself as a man whom fate had led in such a way that he is in a position to enlighten people about the Jewish question.

Q And "enlightenment", is that another word for persecution? Do you mean by "enlightenment" persecutioj?

A I did not understand that.

Q Do you mean by "enlightenment" the word "persecution"? Is that why the Jew was to have no joy from it, from your enlightenment?

A So as to avoid a misunderstanding, I have to say that I was beaten in Freising so much and for days without clothes that I have lost forty per cent of my hearing capacity and people are laughing when I ask. I can't help it that I was treated like that. Therefore, I ask to hear the question again.

Q I can show it to you and we'll repeat the question as loudly as you want it. Do you mean by "enlightenment" the word "persecution"? Do you hear that?

A Enlightenment? I understand and mean by "enlightenment" to tell to another person something which he does not yet know.

Q We won't go on with that. You know, do you not, that, starting with the boycott, which you led yourself in 1933, the Jews thereafter were, during the course of years, deprived of the right to vote; deprived of holding any public office; excluded from the professions; demonstrations wer conducted against them in 1938; they were fined a billion marks after that; they were forced to wear a yellow star; they had their own separate seats to sit on; and they had their houses and their business taken away from them. Do you call that enlightenment?

A That has nothing to do with what I wrote. I did not give the orders. I did not make the laws. I was not asked when laws were prepared. I had nothing to do with these laws and orders.

Q But as these laws and orders were passed you were applauding them and you were going on abusing the Jews and asking for more and more orders to be passed; isn't that a fact?

H0118 - 0047

A I ask to be put up to me which law I have applauded.

Q Now, you told the Tribunal yesterday, did you not, that you were responsible, you thought, for the Nurnberg decrees which you had been advocating for years before they came into force; isn't that a fact?

A The Nurnberg laws? I did not make them. I was not asked before, and I have not signed them. But I state here that these laws are that which the Jewish people have for themselves as law. It is the greatest act of legislation which at any time any modern nation has made for her own protection.

Q I don't propose to--

THE PRESIDENT: I think that is the time to break off.

(A recess was taken until 1400 hours.)

H0118 - 0048

Official transcript of the International Military Tribunal in the matter of the United States of America, the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics against Hermann Wilhelm Goering, et al, Defendants, sitting at Nurnberg, Germany, on 29 April 1946, 1400-1700, Lord Justice Lawrence presiding.

SIR DAVID MAXWELL-FYFE: My Lord, I wonder if the Tribunal would be good enough to consider setting aside a half hour some time for the discussion of the documents of the defendant von Schirach. We are ready to clear up our outstanding points at any time that is suitable to the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

JULIUS STREICHER - Resumed

CROSS EXAMINATION - Continued

BY LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q Now, I just want to ask you a few questions as to the part you played in the various actions taken against the Jews between 1933 and 1939.

Will you look at Document M-6, which is at Page 20 in the document book that you have before you, Page 22 in the document book that the Tribunal have in English. It is page 20 in the German book, M-6, which is already GB-170.

Now, I just want to refer to what you said about the Nuernberg Decrees. You told us this morning that you thought when they had been passed that that was already the final solution of the Jewish question. Will you look at the paragraph beginning in the center of the page "However, to those who believe"?

"However, to those who believe that the Jewish question has been finally solved and the matter thus settled for Germany by the Nuernberg Decrees, be it said that the battle continues. World Jewry itself is seeing to that anyhow, and we shall only get through this battle victoriously if every member of the German people knows that their very existence is at stake. The work of enlightenment carried on by the Party seems to me to be more than ever necessary today, when even many Party members seem to think that these matters are no longer real or urgent."

A Yes, yes, I have written that.

Q What do you mean by saying the battle continues if you have already solved the Jewish problem by the issuance of the Nuernberg Decrees?

H0118-0049

A I have already stated today that the solution of the Jewish problem was regarded by me as having to be solved, first of all, in the country and then internationally. In other words "the battle continues" means in the anti-Semitic Union and the International Union, which I had formed which had representatives from all countries on it, the place where it was discussed, what could be done internationally to terminate the Jewish problem.

Q Are we, therefore, to take it that everything you have said and wrote after 1936 was in connection with an international problem and had nothing to do with the Jews in Germany as such.

A Yes, of course, in the main, international, of course.

Q Let me just refer you to half way through the next paragraph:

"The 'Stuermer's' 15 years of work of enlightenment has already led an army of those who know, millions strong, to National Socialism."

Is that so?

A That is correct.

Q You see, you were telling the Tribunal this morning that up until 1933, and indeed afterwards, the circulation of your paper was only very small. Is it true, in fact, that your 15 years of work had led an army, millions strong, to National Socialism?

A I have said today that the moment the press was coordinated, there were 3,000 newspapers serving the purpose of enlightening about the Jewish problem. There were 3,000 daily papers of the size of "Der Stuermer." Furthermore --

Q Very well. I don't think you need go on. Let me just finish reading through that paragraph:

"The continued work of the 'Stuermer' will help to insure that every German down to the last man will, with heart and hand, join the ranks of those whose aim it is to crush the head of the serpent Pan-Judah."

Wait one moment, let me ask my question. There is nothing there about an international problem. You are addressing yourself to the German people, are you not?

A Yes. That article? Yes. If that article was read abroad, then of course I was also talking to countries abroad, but the remark about crushing the serpent's head, that is a Biblical expression.

H0118 - 0050

Q Will you now let us discuss for a moment the breaking up of the synagogue in Nurnberg, which you have told us about, on the 10th of August of 1938. Will you look at Page 41 of the book that you have in front of you, page 42 of the English document book that the Tribunal has.

Now, we have heard your explanation of that breaking up of the synagogue. The "Fraenkische Tageszeitung" of the 11th of August states this:

"In Nuernberg the synagogue is being demolished. Julius Streicher himself in his greatest work by speech, lasting more than an hour and a half" -- were you talking to the inhabitants of Nuernberg upon the architectural value of their city for an hour and a half on the 10th of August 1938?

A I cannot longer recollect in detail what I have said, but I refer to what you have just remarked, and what is important, or what I found important, is that there was a branch of the Propaganda Ministry in Nuernberg. The chief had press conferences with the editors every day, and at that time during the press conferences he told the editors that Streicher was speaking and that the synagogue was being demolished and that this was to be kept a secret.

H0118 - 0051

Q I asked you, were you talking for that hour and a half on the architectural beauties of Nurnberg and not against the Jews? Is that what you are telling us?

A That, too!; of course, that too.

Q At the press conference, to which you referred -- you no doubt have seen the document; it is page 40 of the Tribunal's document book -- you remember that it was arranged that the show should be arranged in a big way, the show of pulling down the synagogue. What was the object of arranging the demonstration to demolish that synagogue in such a big way?

A I was merely speaking -- what you are hinting here, that was done by the representative of the Ministry of Propaganda but I wouldn't object to it, if you decided to assume, to let me put it like that, that I was in the interest of making a big show if I had been asked.

Q Let me just ask you now a word about the demonstrations which followed that in November of that year.

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: My Lord, I refer to page 43 of the document book; 42 of the German.

BY LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q As I understand it, you tell us that you disapproved of those demonstrations that took place and they took place without your knowledge or previous knowledge. Is that correct, yes or no?

A Yes, it is correct.

Q I just want to remind you of what you said on the following day, the 10th of November. This is an account of what happened: "In Nurnberg and Furth, it described the demonstrations by the crowd against the Jewish murders. These lasted until the early hours of the morning."

I now pass to the end of that paragraph: "After midnight the excitement of the public has reached its peak and the large crowd marched to the synagogue in Nurnberg and Furth and burned those two Jewish buildings where the murder of Germans had been preahhed." That is what happened.

This is now what you say.

LT. COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES: It is on page 44 of the document book, my Lord.

H0118 - 0052

BY LT. COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q "From the cradle, the Jew is not being taught like we are. Such text as 'Thou shall love your neighbor as theyself' or 'If you are smitten on the left cheek offer then your right one'. No. He is told 'With the non-Jew you can do whatever you like.' He is even taught the slaughtering of a non-Jew is an act pleasing to God. For twenty years we have been writin about this in 'Der Stuermer.' For twenty years we have been preaching it throughout the world and we have made millions recognize the truth."

Does that sound as though you had disapproved of the demonstrations that had taken place the night before?

A First of all, I must state that the report, part of which you read, was appearing in a daily paper; therefore, it is a possibility that someone wrote that parts of the Nation arose against the murders and, then, that is in keeping with the order for the Propaganda Ministry in Berlin -- But to start with, that was described as a spontaneous demonstration.

Q That does not answer my question. Does that passage that I have read, sound as though you had disapproved of the demonstrations that had taken place the night before; does it or does it not?

A I was against that demonstration.

Q Just let me read on: "But we know that we have in our midst people who take pity on the Jews, people who are not worthy of living in this town, who are not worthy to belong to the people of whom you are a proud part."

Why should it have been necessary for people to have had pity on the Jews, if you were not --you and the Nazi Party were not persecuting them?

A I have already pointed out today that I was forced, after this demonstration had taken place, to define my attitude in public and say one should not have so much pity, and want to prove that this was a spontaneous action by the people; in other words, the whole thing is not against me, it is for me. The people like I, myself, were opposed to demonstrations and I found that I had cause to -- should I say -- get the public opinion to the point where one might possibly not regard that action as anything too severe.

Q But, why, if you were opposed to it and if the people were opposed to it, should it have been your duty to try and convert them so that they

H0118 - 0053

should be in favor of that kind of thing? Why were you opposed to it and why should you try to convert them against the Jew?

A I don't quite understand.

Q I understand you to say that you were opposed to these demonstrations.

A yes.

Q And that the people also were opposed to the demonstrations and that, therefore, it was your duty to try and stir them up and make them in favor of the demonstrations after they had happened; why should it have been your duty to do that?

A Today, you can possibly say that this or that might have been my duty -- if you put yourself into a situation at the time -- this muddle -- and to come to a quick conclusion, as one might have to in this courtroom, that was quite impossible; what happehed has happened. I was against it and the public opinion, too. What was written about it afterwards, that was done for tactical reasons.

Q Very well. Were you in favor of the aryanization of Jewish houses and businesses? Were in favor of that or did you disapprove of that issue?

A I have said today in great detail, in connection to a statement of Partymember Holz, what my answer to that question is; I have stated it and I am repeating that --

H0118 - 0054

Q. Just a moment, I don't want a speech. I asked you a question which you could answer yes or no. Did you approve or disapprove of the system of aryanization of Jewish businesses and houses?

A. You cannot answer that quickly with yes or no. I have made it clear today, and you will have to allow me, that I tell you just the same again so that there isn't any misunderstanding. My Party member Holz ----

Q. I am not going to allow you to repeat it. I will go on if you are not prepared to answer that question. The Tribunal have heard it and I pass on.

A. I want to answer it.

THE PRESIDENT: Defendant --

THE WITNESS: After the Party member came ---

THE PRESIDENT: You have refused to answer the questinn properly, a question to which you can give either an affirmative or a negative answer. Did you approve or did you not approve? You can give an answer to that and then you can give any explanation afterwards.

THE WITNESS: I was not for the aryanization. When Holz repeated that the houses had been pretty badly knocked about, that we might get finances for a Fau District building, I said "all right, if you can do it, go ahead." I already stated today, that there was negligence on his party.

BY LT. COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q. There were in fact a very great number of Jewish businesses and houses aryanized in Nurnberg and Franconia, were there not?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you just look at a new exhibit, D-835, which becomes GB 330. That is a list -- it is an original document -- it is a list of Jewish property in Nurnberg and Furth which was aryanized. Have you seen that list or anything like it before?

A. No.

Q. Well, you can take it from me, that that list contains the addresses of some eight hundred properties in Nurnberg and Furth which had been taken from the Jews and handed over to aryans. Would you agree that that would be at least eight hundred houses in your city here that were aryanized?

H0118 - 0055

A. I don't know about it. I don't know the details, but I must make a statement. I don't know whether there is ever to be found a statement -- I have already stated today that my Party fellow member Holz started to aryanize. That was rescinded from Berlin and then came the aryanization carried out by the state. I wouldn't have had any influence in that connection, so that this is not my affair at all. This aryanization was ordered, you see, from Berlin; the taking way, I mean, of Jewish property.

Q. Now, you mentioned this morning that you were a subscriber to a weekly newspaper called "Das Israelitische Wochenblatt"; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. When did you start subscribing to that newspaper?

A. What did you say?

Q. On what date did you start subscribing to that newspaper?

A. I don't know.

Q. Well, I have no doubt you can tell the Tribunal approximately. Have you always, since 1933, been a subscriber of that newspaper?

A. Well, I don't think I would have read every edition. I travelled a great deal.

Q. You were, as I think this application of your wife to give evidence states, a regular reader of it, were you not?

A. My editors and I used to share reading this.

Q. May I take it, that between yourself and your editors -- I don't say every copy was read, but it was regularly read from 1933 onwards; is that fair?

A. You cannot say "read regularly."

Q. A large number of the copies that you subscribed for, which came weekly to you, were they read by yourself or by your editors?

A. Certainly.

H0118-0056

Q Now, I want to turn to something else for a moment. I want to make myself perfectly clear to you.

DR. MARX: Mr. President, I should like to draw the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that the document which has just been presented, and which refers to confiscated property and real estate, has the heading "Aryanization Department for Real Estate, Nurnberg". That can't mean anything except that this document, which comes from the official department, was later on used for the confiscation of that real estate. It is that sort of document but by no means can this be a document that can prove that we are here concerned with the real estate aryanized by Holz subsequent to the 9th of November.

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: I accept that that may be so.

DR. MARX: I should like to ask, therefore, that this correction may be made in this connection.

BY LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: If I was mistaken in saying that those properties had been aryanized, I would be right, then, would I not, in saying that that list of properties was prepared by the Aryanization Department in Nurnberg for the purpose of aryanizing them in the future? Would that be a fair statement to make?

A No.

Q I won't pursue that any further.

I want to make myself quite clear to you in what I am suggesting. I am suggesting that from 1939 onwards, you set out to incite the German people to murder and to accept the fact of the murder of the Jewish race. Do you understand that?

A That isn't true.

Q No doubt you will say it isn't true. I just wanted you to be quite clear on what my suggestion is going to be.

I want you to look now at a bundle which will be given to you, of extracts from the Stuermer. You can see the originals which are in court if you desire to do so, but it will save time if we use the document books there.

Now, will you look at page 3-A. For convenience, the pages in this bundle are all marked "A" to distinguish them from the numbers in the original document book.

H0118-0057

THE PRESIDENT: Are they all in evidence?

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: They are none of them in evidence at the moment. Perhaps the most convenient way would be for me to put the actual documents in evidence together at the end, unless the Tribunal or the defendant desire to see any copies of them. I will give them numbers as I go along.

BY LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q Will you look at page 3-A of that bundle, D-809, which Becomes GB-331:

"The Jewish problem is not yet solved, nor will it be solved when one day the last Jew will have left Germany. Only then, when world Jewry has been annihilated, will it have been solved."

Is that what you were working for when you say you were working for the international solution to this problem, the annihilation of world Jewry?

A If that is how you understand "annihilation". That was written by my chief editor at the time. He says, "The problem is not yet solved nor will it be solved when one day the last Jew will have left Germany." And when he says that only then when world Jewry has been annihilated will it be solved, then he probably meant that the power of the Jew should be annihilated. He was thinking of the power; he wasn't thinking of annihilating the men. My fellow Party member Holz didn't think of it either.

Q The German word used there is "vernichtet", is it not? Look at your copy. "Vernichtet" -- that means to annihilate.

A Today, when you look back, you could interpret it like that, but not at that time.

Q We won't waste time because we have got quite a number to look through. Will you look on to the next page. That was in January you were writing that. In April 1939, D-810, GB-332, I refer only to the last two lines. This is an article again by your editor:

"Then perhaps their graves will proclaim that this people of murderers and criminals has, after all, met its deserved fate."

What do you mean by "graves" there? Do you mean excluding them from the business of the world?

A This is the first time that I have seen this article. That is the statement of opinion of a man who was probably looking ahead and making plays on words, but as far as Heimer, and as far as we discussed the Jewish problem, there was no question of our discussing mass extermination; we didn't think of it.

H0118 - 0058

Maybe it was his wish, I don't know, but anyway, that is the way it was written.

Q Very well. Just turn over, will you now, to May 1939, D-811, GB-333. I quote the last six lines:

H0118-0059

"A punitive expedition must come against the Jews in Russia."

This, of course, was before the Russian invasion.

"A punitive expedition must come against the Jews in Russia, a punitive expedition which will provide the same fate for them that every murderer and criminal must expect, death sentence and execution. The Jews in Russia must be killed. They must be exterminated root and branch. Then the world will see that the end of the Jews is also the end of Bolshevism."

A Who wrote that article?

Q It is published in your Stuermer. We can find out, if necessary. It is not written by you, but it is published in your Stuermer, and you have told the Tribunal that you accept responsibility for everything that was written in that newspaper.

A All right, I will assume responsibility, but I want to state that in this, too, is a question of the private opinion of a man who in May 1939 could not have though that from nothing, becau we had no soldiers, a March to Russia could be started. That is very strongly worded opinion of that anti-Semitic person.

Q All I ask you about that is: Is that not advocating the murder of Jews, that article, and if it is not, what is it advocating?

A The whole article would have to be read to me so that I could decide what motives existed for writing something like that. I therefore ask you to give the public the whole article. Then you can make up a proper judgment.

Q Well, we'll go on. We won't waste time unless you really want to see the whole article.

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: My Lord, if I perhaps might be allowed to put these documents in evidence. As your Lordship will see, this bundle is a bundle of extracts from the Stuermer.

DR. MARX: Mr. President, with the permission of the Tribunal, I would like to make the following statement: A number of extracts from the Stuermer have been mentioned here.

H0118-0060

This is the first time that they have been put before me. Some of them are articles which haven't been written by the defendant personally. Some are by Hiemer; some originate from Holz, who was particularly radical in his way of expressing himself, and passages are being quoted which are probably taken out of the proper context.

I must ask, therefore, that I be afforded the opportunity of reading and discussing these extracts, and investigating them together with the defendant Streicher. Otherwise, he might come to the conslusion that his defense is being made too difficult for him, and that it is being made impossible for him to prepare himself appropriately.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, you will no doubt have an opportunity. You will have an opportunity of checking --

DR. MARX: I beg your pardon.

THE PRESIDENT: I have already said that I wished counsel, when they make objections, would put on the earphones so that I can make myself heard.

You will have an opportunity of checking up on these various extracts, and you will be able to introduce, if necessary, any passages which explain the extracts. That is a matter which has been explained to defendants' counsel over and over again.

Colonel Griffith-Jones, are there not certain of these extracts which are written or signed by the defendant?

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: Well, with your Lordship's permiss.. I will refer to some of them, but so that I should not have to re to all of them, I was going to suggest that perhaps I might put them in and, if it is necessary, let the Tribunal know afterwards the numbers of them to save time.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, certainly.

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: I put the whole bundle in evidence and will not refer to all of them.

THE PRESIDENT: Then you can give us the exhibit numbers later.

H0118-0061

LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES: If that is suitable to the convenience of the court.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

BY LT. COL. GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q Well now, the Tribunal will see by looking at this bundle, from the first page which I think is 3-A, to page 25-A, are various extracts which have been written either by yourself or by members of your staff between January 1939 and January 1941.

Do I understand you to say now, to have said in your evidence, that you never knew that Jews were being exterminated in thousands and millions in the eastern territories? Did you never know that?

H0118 - 0062

A No, no.

Q As I understood your evidence about the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt" this morning you said this, as I have written it down:

"Sometime that journal contained hints that everything was not in order. Late in 1943 an article appeared in whichit was said masses of Jews were disappearing but the article did not quote any figures and did not mention anything about murder."

Are you really saying that those copies of the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt", which you and your editors were reading, contained nothing but a hint of disappearance with no mention of figures or murder? Is that what you are telling this Tribunal?

A Yes, and I stick to that.

Q Now, I want you, if you will, to take this bundle and keep it in fron of you. It is a bundle of extracts from the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt" from July 1941 until the end of the war. The Tribunal will be able to see what a fanatic for the truth really tells.

(Witnesshanded document)

LT. COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES: My Lord, this bundle for convenience again is marked"B".

BY LT. COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q Will you look at the first page. That is an article on the 11 of July, 1941.

"Some 40,000 Jews died in Poland during the last year. The hospitals are overfull."

Now, you need not turn over for the moment, defendant. We willturn the pages soon enough.

Did you happen to read that sentence in theissue of the 11 of July, 1941?

A No.

Q Will you look at page 3, 3 "B"? In November, 1941:

"Very bad news comes from the Ukraine. Thousands of Jewish dead are being mourned, amongst whom are many of the Galician Jews who were expelled from Hungary."

Did you read that?

H0118 - 0063

A That might be. It says "thousands", thousands are being mou rned. That is no proof that millions were killed.

Q Very well.

A There is no detail stated. There are no details how they came to their end.

Q If that is the explanation you want to accept we will leave it.

Just go on again. We will look at the next page, the 12 of December, 1941, a month later:

"According to news which has arrived from several sources thousands of Jews, people even speak of many thousands, have been executed in Odessa and so on. Similar news reaches us from Kiev and other Russian cities."

Did you read that?

A I d o not know and if I had read it then it would not change a thing. That is no evidence.

Q But you have told the Tribunal, you know, that there was nothing except for hints of disappearance. Doesn't it show thatyou were not telling the truth when you read these extracts?

A In that case may I saythe following. When the war started we did not receive the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt" anymore. During the later years one could only get the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt" through the police or through black market channels. We got that paper into Germany toward the end and on one occasion we asked the police to receive foreign newspapers and this weeklyand it was stated that was not possible but we nevertheless got it.

I did not read every one of these editions but the ones which I have read were confiscated from my farm and everything that is underlined has been read by me or it was read by my editor-in-chief. I cannot, therefore, guarantee that I read every single thing in that paper.

Q No, I appreciate that and that is why we have quite a number of them. You see, we have an extract for practically every week or month over the course of three years.

I would just like you to turn to page 30 "A" of the "A" bundle. I just want you to see what you were writing after those copies of the "Israelitische Wochenblatt" had been published. This is a leading article by yourself.

H0118 - 0064

"If the danger of the reproduction of that curse of God in the Jewish blood is finally to come to an end, then there is only one way, the extermination of that people whose father is the devil."

And is the word that you use for extermination there "ausrottung", rooting out extirpation?

A First of all, I would like to ask whether this edition is known to my defen counsel, the one you have translated there and is the translation correct?

Q It does not matter. He has copies of all this and he will be able to protec your interests. We are now just testing the truth of the evidence you have given.

Can you tell me, is that extermination? Does that mean murder of Jews? What else can it mean?

A It depends on the connection. In thay case I want you to read the whole article.

Q Well, if there is anything in the rest of the article which can be helpful to you, your counsel will have an opportunity ti see the article and be able to pu it before the Tribunal. I can assure you that the remainder of your articles, as a general rule, do not assist your case.

A When that article appeared mass killing had already taken place a long time ago.

Q Very well. Well now, we will not go through this at any length.

If you will look at your "B" bundle, your bundle of extracts from the "Isreali tisches Wochenblatt"--

THE PRESIDENT: I think you should draw his attention to the date on page 30 "

LT,-COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES: My Lord, I am very much obliged to your Lordship. The 25th of Dece mber, 1941.

BY LT. COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES:

Q If you will glance at "B" bundle you will see a number of extracts from pag 21. Now, I would like you to glance at page 24 of that bundle.

A Page 24?

Q Yes, page 24. This is an article which appeared in the"Israelitisches Woche blatt" on the 27th of November, 1942. I just wondered whether you read this.

"At the Zionist Agency in Geneva gave a report on the position of European Jewry. The number of victims goes into millions. If the present conditions continu and the German program is carried out it is to be reckoned with that instead of si

H0118 - 0065

or seven million Jews in Europe only two million will still be left."

Then there are the three last lines of the extract:

"The Jews who were there had mostly been deported to the notorious unknown destination further to the east. At the end of this winter the number of victims will be four million."

Is that what you call a hint of disappearance of Jews from the East?

A I cannot recollect that I have ever read that but

H0118 - 0066

I do want to say that if I had read it I would not have believed it.

Q Well, now, let us just turn to the "A" bundle again and look at the article that you wrote on the 17 of December, 1942. It is on page 34 "A". This is an article which is initialed "STR" so I presume it was written by you.

"The London newspaper, the "Times" of the 16 of September 1942 published a

A I have not got it yet.

Q Page 34 "A".

A Just a minute.

Q It is headed:

"An eye for an eye, a tooth for a toogh."

"The London newspaper, the "Times" of the 16 of September 1942 published a resolution which had been unanimously passed by the Board of Deputies of British Jews. This resolution expresses the grief and horror of the Anglo-Jewish community at the unspeakable atrocities committed by Germany and her allies, an vassals against the Jews of Europe, atrocities which had only one aim, to exterminate the whole Jewish population of Europe in cold blood."

Now, you must have read of that in the "Times" because you say so.

A Yes.

Q "Strange how the Jews of the Anglo-Jewish community suddenly begin to hear clearly. When the second World War began the Fuehrer of the German nation warned the Jewish war mongers against plunging the world into a blood bath agai and since then the German Fuehrer has warned and prophesized again and again th the second World War, instigated by world Jewry, must necessarily lead to the destruction of Jewry. In the last speech too, the Fuehrer again referred to his prophesy."

Did you write that?

A Yes, this is merely a quotation. It refers to a forecast from the Fuehrer, of which nobody could possibly tell what it really meant.

Q Very well.

If you had not even read that or the "Isrealitisches Wochenblatt", did you ever hear of the declaration of the United Nations which was made on the 17th of December. 1942?

(witness handed document)

H0118-0067

Do you remember hearing of that? You appear to have been reading the "Time: you appear to have been reading some copies of the "Isrealitisches Wochenblatt," Maybe you heard of this declaration which was published in London, Washington and Moscow at the same time with the assent and support of all allied nations and dominions. I will just read it to you and see if you remember it.

"The attention of the Belgian, Czechoslovakian, Luxenburg, Netherland, Norwegian, Polish, Soviet, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslav governments and also the French National Committee, has been drawn to numerous reports from Europe that the German authorities, not content with denying to persons of Jewish race in all the territories over which their barberous rule has been extended the most elementry human rights, are now carrying into effect Hitler's oft repeated intention to exterminate the Jewish people in Europe.

H0118-0068

"From all the occupied countries Jews are being transported in conditions of appalling horror and brutality to Eastern Europe. In Poland, which has been made the principal Nazi slaughterhouse, the Ghettos established by the German invaders are being systematically emptied of all Jews except a few highly skilled workers required for war industries. None of those taken away are ever heard of again. The able-bodied are slowly worked to death in labor camps. The infirm are left to die of exposure and starvation, or are deliberately massacred in mass executions.

"The number of victims of these bloody cruelties is reckoned in many hundreds of thousands of entirely innocent men, women and children.

"The above-mentioned governments and the French National Committee condemn, in the strongest possible terms, this bestial policy of cold blooded extermination. They declare that such events can only strengthen the resolve of all freedom-loving peoples to overthrow the barbarous Hitlerite tyranny. They reaffirm their solemn resolution to ensure that those responsible for the crimes shall not escape retribution, and to press on with the necessary practical measures to this end."

Did you ever hear of this declaration?

A I don't know, but if I should have heard of it, why then I would have to say the following.

After the seizure of power the foreign press published so many cruel stories which turned out to be rumors, that I had no reason to believe anything like this; nor was there any talk about it here, that millions of Jews were killed.

Q Well, you see, it isn't altogether uncorrobotated. You say you had no reason to believe it, but your Israelitische Wochenblatt, which you were subscribing to, was saying exactly the same thing.

Would you look at page 26-b of the B bundle? That is the declaration of the United Nations on the 17th of December. Just

H0118-0069

see what the Israelitische Wochenblatt says on the 18th. And there I quote the second paragraph:

"At that time the Polish Government in London gave the number of Jews executed as 700,000. The Berlin radio declared that these reports were untrue, but admitted that in Poland Jews had had to be executed because they carried out acts of sabotage."

Then the last paragraph quoted:

"'Up to the end of September 1942', writes the Daily Telegraph, 'two million Jews have lost their lives in Germany and in the countries occupied by the Axis, and it is to be feared that the number of victims will be doubled by the end of this year.'"

Did you happen to read that article?

A I can't remember having read it, but I would not have believed it if I had.

Q You see, there is another article in that same paper on the 23rd of December, in the same terms; another on the 20th of December; and another on the 8th of January. Look at what it says on the 8th of January:

"The Polish Government in London has meanwhile issued a new declaration which states that all the information received agrees that a third of the three million odd Jews have lost their lives."

Did you read that?

A I don't know, but I have to repeat, I would not have believed it.

Q Well now, let's see just what you were writing on the 28th of January. Look at 35-a of your own bundle; 35-a. Now just see what your Chief Editor, the witness you are going to call, I understand, Hiemer--see what he has got to say first of all:

"But the Ghetto too, which has today been reestablished in nearly all European countries, is only an interim solution, for humanity, once awakened, will not merely solve the Ghetto question but the Jewish question in its totality. A time will come when

H0118-0070

the present demands of the Jews will be fulfilled. The Ghetto will have disappeared, and with it, Jewry."

What is he referring to, if he isn't referring to the mass killing, murder, of the Jewish race?

A That was a statement of his opinion and conviction. That conviction must be understood the same way as something which a Jewish author wrote in his book in America. Erich Kauffmann wrote, "German people capable of having children should be sterilized, and in that manner the German people should be exterminated." It was at the same time that Hiemer wrote that article, and I want to say that the very severe tone is due to that book from America.

Interrogating officers realize and know that I have repeatedly pointed out--and so does my defense counsel--that I wanted that book to be found. It was in the Voelkischer Beobachter.

Therefore, if, in America, an author called Erich Kauffmann can publicly write that all men in Germany capable of having children should be sterilized, to exterminate the German people, then I say an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. This is a theoretical matter.

Q Very well. I am sure we have heard your explanation. Let's see what you have to say about your own article on the same date. I quote from the middle of the next paragraph:

"But now in the fourth year of this war world Jewry is beginning, in its retrospective reflections, to understand that the destiny of Jewry is finding its fulfillment at the hands of German National Socialism."

What did you mean by that? Perhaps I should have quoted a little earlier, going back to the beginning:

"When, with the outbreak of the Second World War, world Jewry again began to manifest themselves as war mongers, Adolf Hitler announced to the world that the World War conjured up by world Jewry would result in the self-destruction of Jewry. This

H0118-0071

prophecy was the first big warning. It was met with derision from the Jews, as were all the subsequent warnings."

And then you go on to say:

"But now in the fourth year of this war world Jewry is beginning to understand that the destiny of Jewry is finding its fulfillment at the hands of National Socialism."

What did you mean by that?

A What?

H0118-0072

Q What do you mean by saying "World Jewry is finding its fulfilment at the hands of National Socialism?" How did you mean that National Socialism was finding the fulfilment of Jewry's destiny?

A National Socialism could not fulfil the fate, that is to say, the solution, since the Fuehrer intervened with their destiny. That wasn't a solution.

During an interrogation I have pointed out that I personally wanted the entire solution, which was, right from the beginning against even the thought of trying to solve the Jewish problem by means of progroms. If I mentioned destiny, and that the fate of Jewry was to be fulfilled by National Socialism, then I wanted to say that only through National Socialism would the world get the knowledge and the realization that the Jewish problem must be solved internationally.

Q Let's just go on.

"That which the Fuehrer of the German people announced to the world as a prophecy at the beginning of this Second World War is now being fulfilled with unrelenting inevitability. World Jewry, which wanted to make big international business out of the blood of the warring nations, is rushing with gigantic steps towards its exturpation."

And again you use the word "Ausrottung."

Does that mean just as it sounds, as though the fulfilment that you were aiming at was warning the world about Jewry? What do you mean by it? "Rushing with gigantic steps towards its exturpation--Ausrottung?" What did you me an by it?

A This is a warning. The Fuehrer made a prophecy; nobody could interpret that prophecy properly. The prophecy wasn't to revert to only this article, but to ten others. Again and again we referred to these prophecies, the first of which came in 1929. Today we know what the Fuehrer wanted to say; at that time we didn't. And I confess quite openly that with this quotation we wanted to warn world Jewry.

So as to defend myself I might mention in this connection that the author, Dr. Emil Ludwig Kohn, who had left Germany and emigrated to France, had written in the paper Le Sanale, in 1934, "Hitler does not want war,

H0118-0073

but he is being forced into it. If Britain has the last word."--

Q We are not discussing war now. We are discussing the extermination, the mass murder, of Jews by the National Socialists. That is what we are discussing. Let me read on:

"When Adolf Hitler stepped before the German people 20 years ago to submit to them the National Socialist demands which pointed into the future, he also made the promise which was to have the greatest effect in its result, that of freeing the world from its Jewish tormentors. How wonderful it is to know that this great man and leader is making action follow this promise also. It will be the greatest ever to take place amongst mankind."

Do you say that you are not there putting forward propaganda for the policy of mass extermination which the Nazi Government had set out to do?

A We too had the freedom of the press like democratic countries. Every order could be forecast which later on might turn out to be a fact, and we could write about it, which is what I did.

Q Very well.

A But for my defense, Mr.Prosecutor, I want to be allowed to say that war too can be mass murder, with bombing attacks, and all that. And if it is proved that someon says we forced Hitler into war, then I can certainly say that a man who knows that Hitler is being forced into war is a mass murderer.

Q With the permission of the Tribunal I am going to interrupt you again because we are not discussing whether or not Hitler was forced into war. We will leave that now.

Let us just go on and see if you are really speaking the truth in saying that while you were writing these articles you were not perfectly well aware of what was happening in the Eastern Territories.

H0118 - 0074

We got as far as January 1943. I would like you to just look at one ro two of the Isrealitisch Wochenblatt and see if you remember reading any of these.

Will you look at Page 30-b the 26th of February, in your B bundle ?

"Exchange reports from Polish Government circles in London that Warsaw, Lvov, Lodz and other cities have been liquidated, and that nobody from the ghettos remains alive. The latest investigations have ascertained that only about 650,000 Jews remain out of 2,800,000."

Listen to me. Did you read that? Do you remember it?

A I don't know. For months -- I should say six months -- we didn't get the paper. But if I had read it, I would not have believed that either.

Q Did you believe Hitler? If you will turn over the page to 30-b, did you believe Hitler? According to the last two lines quoted in the Israelitische Wochenblatt of the 5th of March:

"Hitler, in his proclamation of the 24th of February, again proclaimed the extermination of the Jews in Europe as his goal."

Did you believe your own beloved Fuehrer when he was saying the same things as the Israelitische Wochenblatt, the United Nations, and the Times newspaper in London?

A No. I declare that whoever heard the Fuehrer from his deepest emotions and his soul, as I have, and who had to learn later what was contained in his testament, and that he gave, clearly conscious of the fact, the order for mass extermination, he will face a puzzle. I state here.

Q We really don't want another long speech about the Fuehrer. Just turn over the page and look at what is being said on the 26th of March:

"The report of the Polish Government published in the English press includes

"In the town of Vilna 50,000 Jews were murdered; in Rovno 14,000; in Lvov half the total Jewish population.

"Many details are also given about the use of poison gas, as at Chelm, of electricity in Belzec, of the deportations from Warsaw, the surrounding of blocks of houses, and of the attacks with machine guns."

Did you read that one?

A I don't know. However, shootings must have occured, of course, where Jews committed sabotage and all that.

H0118 - 0075

That is perfectly clear. During a war that is considered as a matter of course. However, the figures which are quoted here were just simply not believable.

Q Yes. I understand you to say that now, but what I do not understand is what you meant when you said this morning that the Israelitische Wochenblatt made no mention of murders and gave no figures. You didn't say that the figures were unbelievable; you told this Tribunal, on your oath, that the newspaper contained nothing except the hints of dissapearance, with no mention of figures. What did you mean by that?

A I have said the truth under oath, but it is possible that one cannot remember everything. During an interrogation some time back I stated, based on memory, that an edition must exist which mentions the disappearance of Jews, and so on. It is in the Israelitische Wochenblatt. And I thought, as I said, that it was in 1943; and it is true. If one article after the other is put before me -- well, even if I had seen it, how can I remember it? But that I should have told you an untruth deliberately, that is quite wrong.

H0118-0076

Q We will deal with the article you mention in 1933 in one moment; but before we do that, just see if you believe your own staff. Turn, will you, to 384, M-139. Now, on the 6th of May it so happens just after those last three extracts from the "Das Israelitische Wochenblatt" we have looked at, within two or three months, one or two months afterward your newspaper is publishing this article. It is headed "Children of the Devil."

"Der Sturmer paid a visit to the ghettoes in the East. Der Sturmer sent its photographer to various ghettoes; a member of Der Sturmer's staff is well acquainted with the Jews. Nothing can surprise him easily. But what our contributor saw in those ghettoes was a unique experience for him. He wrote, What my eyes and my Leica camera saw here convinced me that the Jews are not human beings but children of the devil and the spawn of crime. It is hard to see how it was possible that this scum of humanity was for centuries looked upon as God's chosen people by the non-Jews. This satanic race really has no right to exist."

Now, you have heard of what was happening in the ghettoes in the East during 1942 and 1943. Are you really telling this Tribunal that your photographer went with his camera to those ghettoes and found out nothing about the mass murder of Jews?

A Yes, otherwise he would have reported to us about it.

Q Warsaw ghetto, you remember, exterminated -- wiped out -- in April, 1943. Your photographer must have been around just about that time, if you were writing on the 6th of May, if he had just returned. Did you think he could have been there looking at ghettoes for Der Sturmer, for Julius Streicher, the Jew-baiter, and have discovered nothing of what was happening in the ghetto in Warsaw and elsewhere?

A I can only remember that immediately after the end of the Polish campaign a Viennese reporter went over there, made films and made reports, and in 1942 I think you will find a name which I would like to know. There will be a signature to show whom it was written by. One thing I know is that the ghetto was destroyed; something which I saw from an illustrated report which I think originated in the Ministry of Propaganda. But mass

H0118 - 0077

executions or the destruction of the ghetto during an uprising -- well, that sounds legal, and I consider it right; but mass murder in the ghetto in Warsaw? That is something I never heard of.

Q Now, just let's look at the article to which you referred a moment ago. Will you look at 44A of the Document Book. My Lord, this is the same as was included at page 35 in the original Document Book, but there is slightly more of the extract quoted at page 44A.

Now, I just want you to examine for the last time whether or not you are speaking the truth in telling the Tribunal that you did not know what was happening. You quote in that article from the Swiss newspaper, "Das Israelitische Wochenblatt", on the 27th of August 1943 -- you will see that date in the centre of the first paragraph -- I start now from that line in the centre. The Swiss Jewish newspaper goes on to say, "The Jews of Europe with the exception of those in England and of the lesser Jewish communities in a few neutral countries have, so to speak, disappeared. The Jewish reservoir of the East, that was able to counter-balance the force of the apparent assimilation of the West, no longer exists." That is the end of your quotation from the newspaper, and you go on to say, "This is not a Jewish lie; it is really true that the Jews have so to speak disappeared from Europe and that the Jewish reservoir of the East from which the Jewish pestilence spread for centuries among the European nations has ceased to exist. If the Swiss newspaper wishes to affirm that the Jews did not expect this kind of treatment when they plunged the nations into the second world war, this is to be believed, but already at the beginning of the war the German Nation's Fuehrer prophesied the events that have taken place. He said that the second world war would divide those who wished it."

Now, are you really saying that when that article was written you did not know how to interpret the word "disappearance," the disappearance of the Jews from the East? Are you really telling the Tribunal that?

A Yes.

The word "disappearance" doesn't mean exterminate from the mass. This is a quotation from the Israelite weekly and is a repeated quotation of what the Fuehrer had prophesied.

H0118-0078

Q Well, now, would you look at the article from which you quote there, which you will find at page 36B -- and I would like you to follow it and we will read the two together. Now, the particular paragraph which I want to read with the "Israelitische Wochenblatt" is that quotation which I have just read to you and you will find the same quotation, My Lord; it starts at the end of the eighth but last line, "The Jews of Europe....." Have you got them in front of you, Defendant?

A I shall listen to you.

Q It would be better, I think, if you followed it. I want to help you as much as possible. Page 44A and 36B. I will read slowly first of all from your Sturmer again, "The Jews of Europe with the exception of those in England and of the lesser Jewish communities in a few neutral countries have so to speak disappeared," and you will see that you then go on in the quotation and say "the Jewish reservoir of the East which was able to counter-balance the force of the apparent assimilation of the West no longer exists."

Now, would you look at that original article, "The Jews of Europe" -- this is 36B -- "the Jews of Europe with the exception of those in England and the lesser Jewish communities in the few neutral countries have so to speak disappeared."

Now -- there you go on, "The Jewish reservoir of the East" -- the original goes on -- "three million dead, the same number outlawed, mentally and physically broken."

Are you telling this Tribunal now that on the 27th of August or when you read that article of the 27th of August, you didn't know that Jews were being murdered in the East, that you had not read of those things in the "Israelitische Wochenblatt"?

A Whether I had read it or not, I wouldn't have believed it, that three million Jews had been killed. That is something I wouldn't have believed. That is why I left it out, I think. At any rate, the German censorship wouldn't have allowed it to spread, something which isn't credible.

THE PRESIDENT: You didn't read the last part of the line.

H0118-0079

LT. COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES: ". . . broken. That is the result of the new order." I am obliged to you. "That is the result", you say, "of the new order in Europe."

Q You say you didn't believe it. Is that what you say, that you must have read it --

A Yes.

Q -- but you just didn't believe it?

A No.

Q Even if you didn't believe it, when you were reading this newspaper more or less regularly, your own camera-man had been to the ghettoes in the East, did you think it right to go on week after week in your newspaper crying out for the extermination, murder of the Jews?

A That isn't true. It isn't true that a murder was demanded, and I repeat again, it was due to the voice from America, that called for our extermination by sterilization, increased mass-murder against Germans, that I as an author can say that the Jews too can be. That is a matter for authors, for writers. But the mass-murders had taken place a long time before, and I state here that if I had known what had in fact happened in the East, then I wouldn't have used these quotations at all which I have used.

Q But, Defendant, you must have known then, after reading that article, after sending your camera-man, when the United Nations published their declaration, after Hitler's prophecies had been made again and again in his proclamations, after you had been fulfilled -- you really say you didn't know?

A The photographer is at your disposal. He is in Vienna, and I ask to have him brought here. And I state that this photographer knew nothing and didn't know anything about mass murders.

THE PRESIDENT: I think we might adjourn now.

(A recess was taken.)

H0118-0080

DR. MARX: Mr. President, with the permission of the Tribunal, and in the interest of clarification, I should like to point out the following: The Prosecutor, Sir Griffith Jones, has mentioned a document, page 38 from Der Sturmer of 6 May 1943. That seems to be an error, because we are dealing here with the Sturmer of 6 March 1943.

That date is of great importance because if the photo-reporter of the Sturmer published a report of the 6 March in the Sturmer, then he must have been, before 6 March 1943 at the Ghetto in Warsaw.

THE PRESIDENT: Why do you say 6 March? The document I have before me has 6 May.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES: There has been a mistake, I am afraid, in the German that Dr. Marx has. I have the original before me, which is 6 May 1943.

DR. MARX: Excuse me. At the present moment, I can not recall when the destruction of the Ghetto of Warsaw took place. That was document 1061-PS. Would you know?

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GRIFFITH-JONES: I can not remember at the moment the document, but the date was, I think from memory, from the 1st to the 23rd of April.

DR. MARX: Then, of course, I beg you to excuse my statement.

Q. Now, we had just dealt with the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt" issue for 26 April, the copy that you quoted from. I just refer you to one more copy of that newspaper. Would you look at page 37-B, which is an issue of 10 September, 1943:

"Statistics presented by the Convening Committee showed that five million out of the eight and a half million Jews of Europe had died or been deported through methodical measures in the campaign of extermination. Through forced labor and deportations, about three million Jews had lost their lives."

Did you read that one?

A. I do not know, and again I would have have believed it. To this day, I do not believe that five million Jews were killed. I consider it technically impossible that that could have happened. I do not believe it. I have not

H0118-0081

received proof of that. I have not received it up until now.

Q. It is quite clear that there were plenty of figures for you quoted in this "Israelitisches Wochenblatt" over the period that we are discussing? Plenty of figures, now it turns out, doesn't it?

A. Pardon?

Q. We will go on. Now, I just want to put one or two further articles of your own to you. You remember what I am suggesting: That you are inciting the German people to murder. We know now that at least you read one article in the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt" where murder is mentioned. I just want to see what you go on to publish in your own paper after that date.

Would you look at page 47 A. This is an article by yourself on 6 January 1944. This is after you had been living on your estate for some time.

"After the National Socialist uprising in Germany, a development began in Europe, too, from which one can expect that it will free this continent once and for all of the Jewish disintegrator of nations and exploiter, and over and above this, that the German example will, after a victorious termination of the second world war, bring about the destruction of the Jewish world tormentor in the other continents as well."

What example was the German nation setting to the other nations of the world? What example do you mean there?

A. Those articles explain what I have already said. I spoke of an international solution of the Jewish question. I was convinced that if Germany in this war had been victorious over Bolshevism, then the possibility would have existed to come to an agreement with the other nations for an international solution of the Jewish question, and if I speak here about destruction, you can not take it as physical destruction by mass killing; as I have said, that is an expression, and again I have to point that out. I do not really believe that Erich Kauffmann really wanted to kill the German people by sterilization, but he wrote about it, and in the same manner, we wrote about it too and used similar expressions.

Q. You have not yet told us what is this international solution that you are advocating by talking about extermination; if it is not murder, what is it?

H0118-0082

What is the solution?

A. I have already said that I founded an Anti-Semites Union, and beyond that Anti-Semites Union among the nations, we wanted to, create movements which should get the possibility beyond the power of governments to act in such a way that an international possibility should be created, such as has been found here in this town. Likewise, I thought that an international congress should take place, should meet, which would solve the Jewish question by the creation of a Jewish state and thereby should destroy the power of the Jews within other nations.

Q. That is your answer -- that you were advocating a Jewish state? Is that all that this comes to? Is it simply that you were advocating a Jewish national home? Is that what you have been talking about in all these extracts that we have read? Is that the solution which you are advocating?

A. Well, I do not know what you want with that question. Of course, that is the solution.

Q. Very well. Let us just go on now. Turn to page 48-A now, will your? This is 24 January 1944:

"Whoever does what a Jew does is a scroundrel, a criminal, and he who repeats and wishes to copy him deserves the same fate -- annihilation, death."

Are you still advocating a national Jewish home?

A. Yes, that has nothing to do with the big political plan. If you take every statement by a writer, every statement from a daily newspaper out of its context and want to prove a political aim by it, then you do not get the desired effect. You have to distinguish between a newspaper article and a great political aim.

Q. Let us just turn now to the next page, 2 March 1944:

"Eternal night must come over the born criminal race of the Jews so that eternal day may make the awakening non-Jewish mankind happy."

Were they going to have eternal night in their national Jewish state? Is that what you wanted?

A. That is an anti-Semitic play of words. Again it has nothing to do with the great political aim.

H0118 - 0083

Q. It may be an anti-Semitic play of words, but the only meaning it could have is murder. Is that not true?

A. No.

Q. Will you turn to the next page, 25 May 1944, and I remind you that these are all after you must have read of the murder in "Israelitisches Wochenblatt". I quote the second paragraph?

"How can we overcome this danger and restore humanity to health? Just as a human being is able to defend himself against contagious diseases only if he proclaims war against the cause of the disease, the germ, so to speak; so the world can be restored to health only when the most terrible germ of all time, the Jew, has been removed. It is of no avail to battle against the outward symptoms of the world disease without rendering the actual cause of the disease innocuous. The disease will nevertheless break out again sooner or later. The cause and the bearer of the disease sees to this itself, the germ, but if the nations are to be restored to health and are to remain healthy in the future, then the germ of the Jewish world plague must be destroyed, root and branch."

Is that what you mean? Are you saying there when you say "must be destroyed root and branch" -- did you mean to say "ought to be given a Jewish national state?

A. Yes, from such a statement in an article, to the will and the actions of mass murder, there is a long way.

H0118-0084

"The struggle against Judaism will be returned. Then the Jew will be extinguished. Then Judaism will be annihilated down to the last man."

Are we to read from these words: Provide the Jews with a Jewish national state

A That is a vision of the future. I would like to call it an expression of a prophetic vision. But it is not incitement to kill five million Jews. That is an opinion of ideology, of conviction, of faith.

Q It is the prophetic vision of what you wanted, isn't it--of what you have been advocating now for the last four years from the beginning of the war? Isn't that what it is?

A Mr. Prosecutor, what one heard years ago at a certain moment, when one wrote that article, one cannot say today. But I had right next to me on the table confessions from the front of Judaism, confessions in which it says the German nation has to be destroyed, bombard the cities, do not save women and children. If you have confessions like these it is possible that out of one's pen that comes which I have written.

Q You know, do you not, even if you do not believe the full figures, that millions of Jews have been murdered since the beginning of the war? Do you know that? You have heard the evidence, have you not? You can answer it.

A I believe it because --

Q I only wanted to know whether you had heard that evidence. You can answer yes or no, and I presume it will be yes.

A Well, I have to say evidence for me is only the testament of the Fuehrer. There he states that the mass executions took place upon his orders. That I believe Now I believe it.

Q Do you think that it would be possible to carry out the extermination of six million Jews in 1921? Do you think the German people would have stood for it? Do you think it would have been possible under any regime in 1921 to have carried out the murder of six million men, women, and children of the Jewish race?

A Whether that would have been possible with the knowledge of the people--no, It would not have been possible. The Prosecutor himself has said here that since 1937 the Party had full control over the people. If the people would have known even then, according to the opinion of the Prosecution, on the basis of the control exercised by the Nazis, they could not have done anything against that dictatorship. But the people did not know it. That is my belief and my conviction

H0118 - 0085

and my knowledge.

Q Was it possible to exterminate people in that way only after some twenty years of incitement and propaganda by you and other Nazis? Is that what made that possible?

A That I do not admit, that there was incitement. There was enlightenment, and sometimes a harsh word may have fallen against the other side as an answer. It was enlightenment--not incitement. And if before history we want to keep our place, I have to state the German people did not want any killings, whether individually or--

Q I am not going to let you go into another history about the German people. I am going to remind you of what you have said.

A Adolf Hitler --

Q I am going to remind you of what you said yesterday. I read from the transcript: "To speak of a Jewish question at the time--" that is 1923 -- "I would like to say the public distinguished Jews only by their religion, to speak about a Jewish problem would have been nonsense."

Was that because there was no Jewish problem then, and that the Jewish problem had only been created by you and the Nazi regime?

A It was my aim, and I reached that goal partly, that if the laws which made impossible sexual intercourse between different races, if that should become law, then the public has to know that Jewry does not mean religion but people and race. I helped to create that basis. Mass killings were not the result of an enlightenment, or, as the Prosecution says, incitement. Mass killings were the last acts of the will of a man who was probably desperate because he saw that he could not conquer--of a great man of history.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: I have no further questions. Perhaps I might be allowed to just sort out the exhibits and then mention to the Tribunal their numbers. If the Tribunal would agree, those that I have put in evidence, which are the other parts of the bundle other than I have actually quoted from, perhaps I could put them all in as one number and hand the exhibits to the Clerk, if that would be the convienient course.

THE PRESIDENT: I think so, yes. If they are in one bundle, and you are going to give one number to a number of documents, it had better be one bundle, hadn't it

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GRIFFITH JONES: Yes.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, do you want to reexamine.?

H0118 - 0086

DR. MARX: I do not consider it necessary anymore.

THE PRESIDENT: Then the Defendant can return to the dock. Dr. Marx, will you continue the Defendant's case?

DR. MARX: I call now, with the permission of the Court, the witness Fritz Herrwerth.

(The witness took the stand.)

THE PRESIDENT: Will you state your full name?

THE WITNESS: Fritz Herrwerth.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you repeat this oath after me:

I swear by God, the Almight and Omniscient, that I will speak the pure truth, and will withhold and add nothing.

(The witness repeated the oath.)

THE PRESIDENT: You may sit down.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY DR. MARX:

Q. Since when do you know the Defendant Streicher?

A. Since the Party day in 1934.

Q. When did you enter his service and in what function?

A. On the 15th of October, 1934, in Nurnberg. I became his employee -- not his personal employee but at that time I was in the municipal motor pool. But I served for Gauleiter Streicher.

Q. When did you leave that service?

A. In August 1943.

Q. For what reason?

A. It was a personal dispute, and mainly due to my fault.

Q. Did you have any other tasks to do for Streicher?

A. Yes.

Q. And which?

A. Well, whatever came up. I did agricultural work also at the end.

Q. In other words, you were very often with Streicher and therefore you knew about the most important incidents during that period?

A. Yes. I don't know, however, what you call important incidents. There were things that I don t know about. At least I assume that.

Q. I will ask you later in detail.

H0118 - 0087

A. Yes, if you please.

Q. The Defendant Streicher is accused to have caused acts of violence against the Jews and to have participated in these acts. Do you know of any such case?

A. Not a single one.

Q. Will you please wait until the end of my question, and then I shall say "end of question." On the 9th of November, 1938, did you drive Streicher back from Munich to Nurnberg, and when?

A. It was on the 19th of November, yes. I do not know the time of the day anymore. Streicher left earlier at that time in Munich, and it may have been about -- I don't know for sure -- 9 o'clock.

Q. Did Streicher know already during that ride back that same night that something was to be done against the Jewish population?

H0118 - 0088

A No, he knew nothing about that.

Q Then, during the night of the 9th of November did you witnessa conversation between Streicher and the SA Fuehrer Herrvon Obernitz?

A Yes.

Q Where did that conversation take place?

A In order to answer that question, I have to go a little further. When Streicher went to bed in the evening, I was usually with him or the superintendent. On that evening Streicher went to bed earlier than usual. I don't know the reason. And that concluded my work for the day. I went from Mr. Streicher to the Casino of the Gauleitung. That was in the cellar of the Gauleitung Building on Schlageter Strasse. I played cards there. And then the SA Obergruppenfuehrer Herr von Obernitz came and called me, as usual, by the name of Fritz and told me--

THE PRESIDENT: When you see that light go on, it means that you are going too fast. Will you try to speak more slowly?

THE WITNESS: Yes, yes, I will try my best.

A (Continuing) The then SA Obergruppenfuehrer Herr von Obernitz came into the Gauleitung headquarters and told me he had to speak to Mr. Streicher very urgently, and I answered him that Mr. Streicher had already gone to bed. Then he told me, "Then you have to wake him up." He said that he would assume the responsibility; it was animportant affair. Herr von Obernitz upon my call went to Streicher's apartment. Mr. Streicher's bedroom is above my apartment. I had the keys and, of course, I could get in at any time.

On the way upstairs to the apartment I noticed that many SA men went through the streets, and I asked Herr von Obernitz about the reason for that. He told me that that night something was going to happen; Jewish apartments were to be destroyed. He did not say anything further to me.

I accompanied Herr von Obernitz to the bed of Mr. Streicher. Herr von Obernitz reported to Streicher about that which had happened that night and was to happen. I cannot recall the details very well any more, but I believe that he said that that night Jewish apartments were to be destroyed. Mr. Streicher, if I may say so, was surprised. He had not known anything about it, and he said literally to Herr von Obernitz, and I remember that very well,

H0118-0089

very clearly. "That is wrong. One cannot solve the Jewish question like that. Do what you have been ordered. I do not takepart in it. If anything should occur that you need me, then you can come for me." Upon that, and I can also mention that Herr von Obernitz said, "Hitler has said the SA should be able to let loose their emotions once as retribution for the case which had occurred in Paris in connection with Herr von Rath." Streicher stayed in bed and did not go out during that night.

Q Stop here please. Did von Obernitz mention anything about the fact that synagogues were to be burned?

A I believe so, yes. But, as much as I remember, Streicher refused to do that, too, because the synagogues, as much as I know, were burned by the fire department, and upon orders from Herr von Obernitz.

Q How do you know that?

A I was there.

Q Did youwatch it?

A Yes, I was at the synagogue during that night.

Q And how could one assume that the fire department started the fire?

A How that could be assumed I don't know, but I saw it. The people of the fire department started the fire.

Q Well, had you already seen it? Were you there to see how the fire was started or did you arrive when the building was already on fire?

A The building was not yet on fire, but the fire department was there already. That's all I can say. That's true.

Q Did Streicher at that time mention anything about the fact that he was afraid of a new wave of incitement on the part of the world press to be started now if the synagogues were burned and did he say that that is why he refused to do it?

A I believe so, yes, but I couldn't say definitely; but, if I remember correctly, they spokabout that.

Q Did Obernitz say from whom he had received the order?

A He only used the phrase that Hitler had said the SA should be able to let loose their emotions once.

Q Is it correct that you, witness, told your wife during the same night about that conversation between Obernitz and Streicher?

H0118 - 0090

A I believe I did not speak about the conversation but, when I walked down from the second floor to my apartment, I told my wife that I would probably be a little late because that night that action was going to be started, and I told her shortly what was going to happen but nothing about the conversation.

Q Then, later you were at the Pleichershof, the farm, when Streicher had been forced to retire there or had retired?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember an incident where the later Mrs. Streicher spoke about the incidents at Magdeburg which had occurred the same night there?

A No, no, I know nothing of that.

Q Didn't you tell the then Mrs. Merkel that you wouldn't talk about these incidents because Streicher always got very excited about them?

A I couldn't recall that Streicher had said once that he was to have been right in his assumption and that is that a short time after that night he received information, for instance, I don't know through whom, that the glass for the windows had to be bought from Holland again. Streicher said at that time that that is the first time we mentioned the correctness of his opinion.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, just one moment.

Sir David, would it be convenient to you and the counsel for the defendant von Schirach if we discussed the question about the documents at 9:30 tomorrow morning?

SIR DAVID MAXWELL FYFE: My Lord, I will find out. Yes, counsel for von Schirach says that he thinks it is all right.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well, 9:30 tomorrow morning.

BY DR. MARX:

Q What observations did you make during your stay at the Pleichershof farm about the opinion of Streicher with regard to the Jewish question? What was that about the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt"?

A Well, what do you want to know about the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt": Streicher received it.

Q Did he receive it regularly?

H0118-0091

A Yes, I believe I can say that quite certainly. I saw large heaps of newspapers of the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt". They came continuously.

Q Mr. Streicher said that during the first years of the war he had great difficulty to get that paper and the police did not release it easily?

A Yes, that can very well be. I do not know what year they were. I saw them. Today it is difficult for me to tell of what year these papers were.

Q Yes, you said there were large heaps of them.

A Yes, on and off, but there were also some other newspapers; Swiss newspapers were there, the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt", and so on. There were always so many newspapers and among them I saw here and there the "Israelitisches Wochenblatt". I mean to say that it would not be possible for me to say how many there were.

Q All right. Did Streicher speak at times about his knowledge of happenings in the East or of happenings in concentration camps in the East?

A Yes, Streicher did not--well, Streicher did not know anything about it. He could not say anything about it. At least that's my conviction.

Q How come? Did you ever speak to him about it?

A No, not that I know of; I didn't know anything about it myself.

Q Did you ever receive knowlddge of a letter in which Streicher was reproached by Reichsfuehrer SS Himmler because he treated the imprisoned Frenchmen too well? Do you understand me?

A Yes, I understood, but I have to think about it. I know quite well that Streicher mentioned at times about the treatment of prisoners. I know that the Frenchmen were treated very well, but whether the cause for that was a letter from Himmler, that I don't know.

Q No, no. The cause for a good treatment, you mean?

A No, the cause that Streicher spoke about it. Streicher spoke about reproaching, about the good treatment of the Frenchmen; but the fact that he spoke about it, whether that was caused by a letter from Himmler or not, that I don't know.

Q Yes.

A But I do not believe that there was not a single Frenchman who could complain about bad treatment.

H0118 - 0092

Q You were no more present when the French left?

A No.

Q Do you know about an incident when the manager of the publishing firm came to Streicher, into his garden, and told him that he had told the truth to the police in an affair concerning shares?

A I have to ask you to give me that question in more detail. I do not know all about it, but part of it. I know that Director Fink was standing in tears before Streicher, that he cried, that he accused himself, that he was a rascal and a traitor, but why I don't know. Then Streicher ran into the garden with him, and I only saw that Fink cried. I can still hear how he accused himself.

Q Do you know that Streicher at times and at certain intervals brought people from the S.P.D. and the K.P.D. from the concentration camps, Social Democratic Party and Communist Party?

A Yes.

Q How many were there?

A I don't know. It was about every year around Christmas. I estimate that there were about 100 to 150 men every year. They came from Dachau. Mr. Streicher, in the Hotel Deutscher Hof, had dinner prepared for them in a separate room; and I believe that is where they also met their families -- that is to say, the prisoners met the members of their family. Streicher also saw to it that the prisoners who were then released found work, and he intervened personally for them.

Q Did he also get one or another of these prisoners to work?

A Yes.

Q What do you know about that?

A I remember three men, I believe, came into the Mars works, the motorcycle factory. Streicher then at that time told the Plenipotentiary for X the Labor Front to get these people in, as much as I remember.

Q What was the attitude of Streicher when he found out that members of the Party had acquired cars and villas of Jewish property at very low prices?

A I can still remember when Mr. Streicher returned from Berlin. I

H0118 - 0093

don't know how much Streicher knew at that time about these purchases, but, at any rate, when Streicher returned from Berlin where Goering had made statements about these cheap, low price purchases of buildings, Streicher was at the railroad station. I witnessed that myself. He said that at once these purchases had to be nullified.

Besides, I know only about onecase where a Party member purchased a house. I don't know whether there were more of them.

Q Do you know whether Streicher on his farm was under surveillance by the Gestapo and there was a prohibition against visiting him there?

A First, in answering the first question, I cannot say for sure that criminal agents were there, but one could assume that they were there. I know of a woman who even stated that she had been photographed in the forest when she came from the railroad station to the farm. And what was the second question?

Q Whether people were prohibited from visiting him.

A Oh, yes. Throughout the city I met various members of the Party, and whomever I asked told me, "Well, one cannot get out there, one cannot go out there." And if I asked, "Well, who said that?" Then no one wanted totalk about it, but, as one heard it, a prohibition was expressed by the Deputy of the Fuehrer, Hess.

Q Do you know anything about the fact that Streicher, when he found out that an act of violence had been committed against Jews or other political adversaries or were only intended, that he stopped them immediately?

A Yes. At least, on the basis of his statement he always said that that was wrong.

Q Do you know of any individual case where he took measures against somebody who had committed such violations? If you don't know it, say so.

A Well, at this time I could not recall any particular case.

Q Do you know anything about that affair concerning the Mars Works shares?

A Yes.

Q What do you know about it?

A I know about that case through statements by Streicher. I was not a

H0118-0094

witness to these events myself, but Mr. Streicher told me frequently later what had happened. Shall I describe it?

Q Yes, but very briefly, please.

A Streicher was at that time in a Turkish bath, and his adjutant Koenig came and offered the shares to Streicher. Streicher said, "What kind of shares are they?" The answer was, "They are shares of the Mars Works." He said, "How many?" The answer was "One hundred thousand Marks." Then Streicher said "How much are these?" He said "5,000 Marks." Streicher asked, "Why are these shares so cheap?" Then finally Fink, I believe, said, "Because they are Jewish shares."

And whoever knows Streicher as well as I do knows that Streicher would never have taken anything from a Jew. He protested very definitely against the fact that such an offer had been made to him at all.

That seemed to settle that dispute, and then suddenly the Gauleiter, Streicher, had the thought that with that money he could possibly reconstruct the third Gau building. He pointed that out to the gentlemen as they left, and they decided to buy the shares. Streicher only said that definitely no Party money should be used for that. Then both did not know what to do. Streicher said he would like to advance these 5,000 Marks.

That settled the case, but I had an experience later about it. It was about one and a half years after that negotiation that Streicher had had in Munich. At that time the wife of NSKK Obergruppenfuehrer Zuehlen came to me and asked whether I knew already that the criminal police was given orders at Nurnberg to investigate the case Streicher. I said no and told them "If you want to know something or if they want to know something, why don't they come out to the farm to Mr. Streicher himself? He will give them all the information desired."

After about two to three weeks, I met "Der Stuermer" director Fischer, successor to Fink. He told me -- no, I have to mention first that the shares, together with the 5,000 Marks, were confiscated by Streicher. Director Fischer told me that on that same day he had received a phone call from the trustee company, and that trustee institution reported to Fischer that on the account of the "Stuermer" they had transferred 5,000 Marks which Streicher at

H0118-0095

that time had advanced for thepurchase of the shares.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx, don't you think he is going into rather too much detail about this?

DR. MARX: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I will make it shorter.

The man of the trustee firm told me that the 5,000 Marks were released because the complete innocence of Streicher had been proved.

Q You witnessed the Supreme Party Court session. What did Fink say at thattime? Did he not accuse himself that he had told the trhtu?

A I was not present when Fink was questioned.

Q Then I would like to ask you, you were present when the incident at Munich occurred at the Kuenstlerhaus. That story of the man who accosted Streicher -- can you give us a description of how that incident occurred?

A Yes. Streicher left the room after dinner. I could not remember the words spoken, but I am going to try to describe it as well as possible. Streicher left the room, and as he left that man approached Streicher in a very disagreeable manner. Streicher continued on his way and was without words. He asked the people around him, myself also, whether we knew that man. Nobody knew him.

Then Streicher sent his son, Lothar, back into the room again to speak to the man and to ask him what the reason was for his behavior. Lothar Streicher came out and said that the man had behaved just in the same manner again.

Q Will you please be more brief? You should only tell us how that incident occurred and what caused you or Streicher to use violence against the man.

A You mean my behavior?

Q Yes. What happened then?

A Streicher asked for a room, and in that room Streicher spoke to the man personally. There again the man made incriminating remarks, and then it came to a thrashing by Lothar Streicher. He was a strong man, and it of cours took all of us to get him down.

Q All right.

DR. MARX: Then I am through with this witness, Mr. President.

H0118 - 0096

THE PRESIDENT: Do any of the defense counsel want to ask any questions? Do any of the prosecution counsel wish to cross examine? Then the witness can retire.

(The witness retired)

DR MARX: Then I should like to call the witness Wurzbacher, if he is available; is he not? I don't know which one of the witnesses is still available. Is there anyone?

THE MARSHAL: Frau Streicher is available.

THE PRESIDENT: Is not the witness Wurzbacher here?

THE MARSHAL: I will see, sir. He was not here awhile ago. He was not called for.

THE PRESIDENT: What other witnesses have you got, Dr. Marx?

DR. MARX: The wife of the defendant could be called as a witness, now.

THE PRESIDENT: Very well, let her be called, then.

THE MARSHAL: The witness Strobel is available, now.

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Marx wants to call Mrs Streicher.

DR. MARX: Excuse me, Mr. President. If it is rather difficult to call Mrs. Streicher, then the witness---

ADELE STREICHER, a witness took the stand and testified as follows:

BY THE PRESIDENT:

Q Will you give me your full name?

A Adele Streicher.

Q Will you repeat this oath after me:

I swear by God, the Almighty and Omniscient, that I will speak the pure truth and will withhold and add nothing.

(The witness repeated the oath)

THE PRESIDENT: You may sit down.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY DR. MARX:

Q You are a born TAPPE, from Magdeburg?

A Yes.

Q Were you a member of the NSDAP or of the Frauenschaft?

A No.

H0118 - 0097

Q When did you become Mr. Streicher's secretary and for how long were you in that job?

A On the 7th of June 1940, I became Julius Streicher's secretary and I remained in that job until the end of the war.

Q And during that period, you were continuously on his side?

A Yes, I was always with him.

Q Were you also in charge of the total correspondence for Mr. Streicher?

A Yes.

Q Were you also in charge of the total correspondence for Mr. Streicher?

A Yes.

Q What did that correspondence mainly consist of?

A Mainly letters to his son and to relatives.

Q What was Streicher's activities during that period of time, of the period of five years?

A Mainly physical work; that is, agriculture and gardening, and from time to time he wrote articles for the "Der Stuermer."

Q During these five years, did he leave the farm at all or was he at one time absent from the farm?

A During the first few years he did not leave the farm at all or was he at one time absent from the farm?

Q The greatest extent of his absence was not an entire day or entire night.

H0118 - 0098

Q Do you have any knowledge that it was prohibited for individuals of the Party to visit Streicher?

A Yes, there was such a prohibition.

Q How do you know that?

A From conversations and then I experienced myself when Dr. Goebbels visited the farm, that Julius Streicher told him "Doctor, you dare to come here? Don't you know that there is a prohibition by the Party to visit me?"

Q When did the visit of Dr. Ley and Dr. Goebbels occur?

A Dr. Ley came on the 7th of May 1944 to the farm. The visit of Dr. Goebbels occurred on the 4th of June 1944.

Q Would you please describe the character of these visits and what was the object of the conversation?

A Both visits were of a definitely unofficial character. Dr. Ley wanted mainly to know how Julius Streicher was doing personally and no political questions were treated. Ley said only "Streicher, the Fuehrer is waiting for you."

Q And what did Streicher say to that?

A Streicher answered that he had become accustomed to solitude, that he was happy as a farmer and Ley should tell the Fuehrer that Streicher had no further wishes. At the visit of Dr. Goebbels the subject of the conversation was mainly why Julius Streicher had been released from office as Gauleiter, and Dr. Goebbels was of the opinion that Streicher should return into the circle of old Party members but he gave him the same answer, "Tell the Fuehrer I have no wishes."

Q During these conversations, were you always present?

A Yes.

Q Was not the Jewish question a subject of conversation?

A No, they never spoke about the Jewish question.

H0118 - 0099

Q Did they not speak about the happenings in the Eastern Territories or in the concentration camps?

A No, that never came up.

Q Did not Streicher speak to you about his thoughts which he had expressed in articles in "Der Stuermer" or intended to express and at these occasions; didn't he also speak about the manner in which he thought the solution of the Jewish problem could be found?

A From one conversation with Julius Streicher, I could see with absolut certainty that he did not expect the Jewish question to be solved by acts of violence but by the emigration of Jews from Europe and their settlement in territories outside of Europe.

Q Did Mr. Streicher keep up contact with leading people; was he in correspondence with leading personalities of the Party or of the State?

A No, neither personally nor in correspondence was there any such connection.

Q I will now mention several names, of which I want you to tell whether this has any connection: Himmler, Heydrich, Bormann, or other leading men of the police or the SS or the Gestapo?

A No, with these men, with the exception of one letter from Mr. Himmler, there was never any correspondence from the others.

Q And what was the cause for that letter?

A In that letter Himmler complained about the fact that the prisoners of war who were employed on our farm were treated too well.

Q How was the treatment of the prisoners of war and the foreign civilian workers on the farm?

A On the Streicher Farm, eight French prisoners of war, one Polish girl and one Slav girl were employed. They were all treated very well and very humane Each personal service for which Julius Streicher asked, each worker for which he asked personally, for each of these services they got extra present, cigarettes and money. With some of the Frenchmen, such a good relation developed during the years that they were there, they assured us that they would visit Julius Streicher after the war with their families.

Q Didn't Streicher finally receive credible knowledge about these mass

H0118 - 0100

execution in the East?

A I believe in 1944. It occured in 1944 when he found out about it through Swiss newspapers. Officially, we were never informed about it.

Q But it is asserted that before, already, he had had knowledge?

A No.

Q You don't know anything about it?

A I only know about the Swiss newspapers.

Q You once led the conversation to the fact that in Magdeburg, from the 9th to the 10th of November during 1938, you witnessed a demonstration against the Jews and that you were very indignant about it. Is that true?

A Yes, I have spoken about it, and I was shocked when these actions took place. Julius Streicher at that time got very excited during that conversation and said such nonsense had occurred in Nurnberg also. That was not anti-Semitism; that was just stupidity.

Q Is it correct that Streicher was hardly interested in financial affairs of the publishing firm and left these things to the manager?

A Julius Streicher never bothered about financial affairs, neither in the house nor in the firm, and the gentlemen of the firm were always disappointed when they spoke or reported or wanted to report about matters of accounting and Streicher told them, "Leave me alone with your business matters. There are other things besides money that are important."

Q How did he take care of the household expenses, then?

A I received 1,000 marks every month from the firm. That took care of the household, of presents, and so on.

Q Do you know that he is supposed to have acquired shares which were acquired on the basis of pressure against a Jewish banker?

A That is quite impossible. I consider it quite impossible that Julius Streicher acquired shares that way. I believe that he doesn't even know what a share looks like.

Q Did he tell you anything about it?

A I only know that he never received shares.

Q How did it come about that in April 1945 you and the defendant were married?

A (No response)

Q Did you understand the question?

A Yes. Julius Streicher wanted to take part in the struggle in Nurnberg. I wanted to be with him. He wanted to give me his name before we went. We wanted to die together.

Q Then you went with him, you left the Fleischershof with him, and where did you go from there?

A First we wanted to go to Nurnberg, and that was refused. Then we went in the direction of Munich. In Munich we were told to continue in the direction

H0118-0101

of Passau. From Passau they sent us to Berchtesgaden; from Berchtesgaden they sent us to Kitzbuehl.

Q How did it happen that the original intention to go into death together did not come about?

A The cause for that was a conversation with three young soldiers.

Q And what was that conversation?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think youshould go into that, Dr. Marx.

BY DR. MARX:

Q Well then, you do not need to answer. Only one more question.

Is it correct that Streicher gave the manager of his publishing firm a power of attorney which meant that that man could dispose of it as he wanted?

A Yes, that is true. He gave the power of attorney to the manager of the firm, whoever it was at that time, and that meant full confidence in whatever he wanted to do.

DR. MARX: Mr. President, I have no more questions.

THE PRESIDENT: Do any of the defendants' counsel want to ask any questions?

Does the Prosecution wish to ask any questions?

SIR DAVID MAXWELL-FYFE: No.

THE PRESIDENT: Then the witness can retire, and the court will adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

(The Tribunal adjourned until 30 April 1946 at 0930 hours.)

H0118-0102